THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

Vol. XXXII 1951 Part 2

ORIGINAL PAPERS

PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND THE PROBLEM OF ÆSTHETIC VALUE

By HERBERT READ[1]

Twenty-five years ago, with more enthusiasm than discretion, I published an essay on ' Psycho-analysis and Criticism '.[2] I find that I already made there the distinction which is to be the starting-point of my present discourse—it will perhaps save time if I repeat my own words. After some remarks on the scope of literary criticism, which I claimed as a separate science, I referred to another consideration which, I said, might put the whole utility of the discussion in doubt, ' the very obvious difference in the subject matter of our two sciences: psychology is concerned with the *processes* of mental activity, literary criticism with the *product*. The psychologist analyses the product only to arrive at the process: art is, from this point of view, as significant as any other expression of mentality. But of no more significance: its significance does not correspond to its value as literature. The psychologist is indifferent to literary values (too often, alas, even in his own work), and may even definitely deplore them, especially when they represent the trimming of subjective phantasies under the influence of some objective standard or tradition. But in any case the psychologist has found and will always find a large body of material in the imaginative literature of all epochs. . . . But whether in the nature of things it is possible for such psychology to add anything positive to the principles of literary criticism is more in doubt. Analysis involves the reduction of the symbol to its origins, and once the symbol is in this way dissolved, it is of no æsthetic significance: art is art as symbol, not as sign.' [3]

It is to that dogmatic statement I now return. I made no attempt at the time to justify this definition of art as symbol, nor to define what in this context I meant by the word ' symbol '. Indeed, I now realize that my statement was in the nature of a lucky guess, which at the time I should have been at a loss to substantiate. Since that time the whole question of symbolic modes of expression has been raised, and symbolism, in a sense to be defined, has become the central principle of æsthetics. That, at first, might seem satisfactory from the psycho-analyst's point of view, but he is doomed to be disappointed. Our æsthetic symbolism has nothing in common with his psychic symbolism, and it is a pity that we have to use the same word to describe different things. But let us first look at the word itself.

The root of the word is in the Greek βολή, βόλος, meaning a throw, and the original sense was that of throwing normally separate things together. Its first use in English seems to have been theological, in the sense of a summary statement of articles of faith, a credo; and from that use it gradually acquired the sense of a visible object standing for something sacred and invisible—for example, wine for the blood of Christ. But in the sixteenth century the word could still be used in its original meaning—for

[1] The ' Ernest Jones ' lecture, read before the British Psycho-Analytical Society, November 15, 1950.

[2] *The Criterion*, Vol. III, No. 10 (January, 1925). Reprinted in *Collected Essays in Literary Criticism*, London (Faber & Faber), 1938.

[3] *The Criterion*, loc. cit., 215–6.

example, the Elizabethan poet, Barnabe Barnes, asks what is life? and one of his replies runs:

> A watery bubble symbolized with air.

We would now say 'inflated', but Barnes's use of the word has a poetic precision—two distinct elements, air and water, seen as thrown together.

I shall not describe all the meanings that have been attached to the word symbol in the past three or four hundred years. The American logician, Charles Peirce, came to the alarming conclusion that there are 59,049 types of 'symbol-situation', and it would need several lectures to separate those classes that might be defined as æsthetic. But there is a very general distinction to be made between those uses of the word which on the one hand retain the sense of a throwing together of tangible, visible objects, with each other or with some immaterial or abstract notion, and those uses which on the other hand imply no such initial separation, but rather treat the symbol as an integral or original form of expression. A word itself may be a symbol in this sense, and language a system of symbolism. The science of algebra is a still more extreme example of such a system. We might say with Whitehead that 'language and algebra seem to exemplify more fundamental types of symbolism than do the Cathedrals of Medieval Europe'.[4] That is to put art in its place, well below algebra; but Whitehead goes on to distinguish a still more fundamental type of symbolism, and it is symbolism in this sense which concerns us now.

I have borrowed Whitehead's illustration on a previous occasion, but I must use it again. It comes from his book on Symbolism. 'We look up and see a coloured shape in front of us, and we say—there is a chair. But what we have seen is the mere coloured shape. Perhaps an artist might not have jumped to the notion of a chair. He might have stopped at the mere contemplation of a beautiful colour and a beautiful shape. But those of us who are not artists are very prone, especially if we are tired, to pass straight from the perception of the coloured shape to the enjoyment of the chair, in some way of use, or of emotion, or of thought. We can easily explain this passage by reference to a train of difficult logical inference, whereby, having regard to our previous experiences of various shapes and various colours, we draw the probable conclusion that we are in the presence of a chair. I am very sceptical (says Whitehead) as to the high-grade character of the mentality required to get from the coloured shape to the chair. One reason for this scepticism is that my friend the artist, who kept himself to the contemplation of colour, shape and position, was a very highly trained man, and had acquired this facility of ignoring the chair at the cost of great labour. We do not require elaborate training merely in order to refrain from embarking upon intricate trains of inference. Such abstinence is only too easy. Another reason for scepticism is that if we had been accompanied by a puppy dog, in addition to the artist, the dog would have acted immediately on the hypothesis of a chair and would have jumped on to it by way of using it as such. Again, if the dog had refrained from such action, it would have been because it was a well-trained dog. Therefore the transition from a coloured shape to the notion of an object which can be used for all sorts of purposes which have nothing to do with colour, seems to be a very natural one; and we—men and puppy dogs—require careful training if we are to refrain from acting upon it.'[4a]

Let me try to summarize these three degrees of symbolization. There is first of all the *word* 'chair', a monosyllabic sound standing for, and conjuring up, the image of an object made of wood or some other material. What kind of shape or colour of chair we imagine depends on our experience of chairs—the member of a club in Pall Mall will have one image, and the condemned murderer in an American prison quite another; or it may be that in certain contexts we do not need to visualize the chair at all—that will depend on our psychological disposition. In reading the passage from Whitehead I personally visualize Van Gogh's yellow chair; but another person with a more conceptual mode of thought may not visualize any chair at all. He holds the word in mental suspense, as it were, and will only visualize in case of necessity.

Now suppose that the person who cannot visualize the chair is a professor of psychology; he will then tell you that he holds the chair of psychology in a certain University. His use of the word 'chair', not to mention the notion of *holding* that chair, is symbolic. Actually the word 'chair', used in this sense, takes us back

[4] *Symbolism* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 2.

[4a] *Ibid.*, 3–4.

to the medieval Cathedral—that compendium of symbolism of all kinds. The very word cathedral is derived from the Latin *cathedra*, and originally referred to the chair of a bishop in his church—chair and cathedral come from the same Greek root καθέδρα. The chair in this sense, therefore, is a symbol of the abstract notion of authority.

Then, thirdly, there is the chair itself: a coloured shape provoking in the artist, not abstract notions, not associations of any kind, but an object with colour and shape, which colour and shape provoke certain sensations which may be pleasant or unpleasant. The chair, as object, becomes the symbol for certain feelings, a *pattern of sentience*, as it has been called.[5]

The basic symbolism involved in æsthetic experience is of this latter kind. It follows that any conception of art which concentrates on one of the other types of symbolism, to the exclusion of presentational immediacy or sense-perception, is completely off the track. We must decide whether this criticism applies to the psycho-analytical approach to art.

I ought perhaps to add that the phrase ' presentational immediacy ', which I take from Whitehead, has not quite the same significance as ' sense-perception ' as commonly used. It is a perceptive mode that excludes all details of accident and environment not intrinsic to the thing perceived. The qualities belonging to the thing perceived are abstracted from their involvement in ' the complex organisms forming the community of the contemporary world '. In this sense Peter Bell was a better poet than Wordsworth imagined, for—

> A primrose by a river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more.

Further, for Whitehead ' presentational immediacy is an important factor in the experience of only a few high-grade organisms, and . . . for others it is embryonic or entirely negligible '. I am not quite sure whether Whitehead is here making a distinction between different types of human beings, or between human beings and animals.[6]

I shall return to the problem of æsthetic symbolism, because I am not entirely satisfied with the theories I have so far discussed; but first I would like to examine the approach that psycho-analysis has in fact made to the definition of æsthetic values.

Admittedly, there is no reason why psycho-analysis should concern itself with the problem at all, unless it can be shown that art has some therapeutic value, or that æsthetic experience is an essential factor in psychic integration. But that can be done only if we have a proper understanding of what is involved in æsthetic experience.

The psycho-analyst from this point of view would be concerned with the *dynamics* only of æsthetic experience, and not with value judgements. The value of a work of art, it might be said, is its value for the particular mental organization of the individual. One set of circumstances (environment and upbringing) will ensure an æsthetic response only from the *Merry Widow*; another set of circumstances will ensure an æsthetic response only from *Fidelio*. More decisively, the æsthetic culture of a Pacific Island will have no significance for the inhabitants of Bournemouth or Edinburgh; and *vice versa*. The æsthetic experience is genuine and effective in each case, and from the psychologist's point of view no criterion for comparative evaluation of such disparate art products is conceivable.

But from the point of view of the philosopher of art such a criterion is essential, and does exist.

Freud's own approach to the problem of æsthetic values was always very tentative—indeed, disarmingly modest. Nevertheless it is from his indications of a method that the now quite considerable literature of the subject has grown. It began with Otto Rank's essay *Der*

[5] By Susanne Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1942.

[6] Dr. W. R. D. Fairbairn is, so far as I know, the only psycho-analyst who has given adequate recognition to the presentational immediacy of the object in æsthetic experience.* He has been impressed, quite rightly, by the phenomenon of the ' found object '—the casually discovered object which, while not being the creation of an artist, functions as a work of art in æsthetic experience—a fact which the surrealists exploited with wonderful effect. I shall refer again to Dr. Fairbairn's paper, and for the present merely note that he defines æsthetic experience as ' The experience which occurs in the beholder when he discovers an object which functions for him symbolically as a means of satisfying his unconscious emotional needs.' Discovery, or rather, recovery, is the essential feature of the experience.

* In two papers contributed to the *Brit. J. Psychol.*: ' Prolegomena to a Psychology of Art ', **28** (1938), 288–303; ' The Ultimate Basis of Æsthetic Experience ', **29**, Pt. 2 (1938), 167–181.

Künstler, first published in 1907, and there are indications that Freud was content to leave this aspect of psycho-analysis to his colleague. Rank's application of the Freudian hypothesis was wholly orthodox: art was given a basis in sexuality, and in the manifestations of the psyche the work of art found a place somewhere between pan-sexuality and hysteria. 'Art develops', he says, 'from the infantile dream to the neurosis and attains its peak in times of greatest psychic need, when the people are enabled by means of their artists to balance over the abyss of hysteria with the virtuosity of a sleepwalker.'[7] The artist is fundamentally neurotic, and in his art overcomes his neurosis; and other neurotics, who do not happen to be artists, are nevertheless influenced for the good—they get a vicarious uplift from their appreciation of the work of art.

At the beginning of his book, Rank printed in large type on a blank page a quotation from *All's Well That Ends Well*: 'Is it possible, he should know what he is, and be that he is?' The implication, on which the whole of his hypothesis rests, is that artistic creation is an unconscious, even an automatic process, and that if the artist had any inkling of the sexual motivation of his work, the drive would cease, his Pegasus would be hamstrung. It would seem, therefore, that the artist's slogan should be 'My goodness, my neurosis'.

If Freud's own approach to the problem was originally the same as Rank's, he has nevertheless from time to time thrown out suggestions which go beyond the neurotic hypothesis. For example, already in 1908, in his paper on 'The Poet and Day-Dreaming', he admits that the relation of the phantasies of 'a man of literary talent' gives pleasure, whereas the phantasies of the ordinary day-dreamer merely bore us, or even repel us. But how the writer accomplishes his effect of pleasure remains, Freud says, 'his innermost secret; the essential *ars poetica* lies in the technique by which our feeling of repulsion is overcome. . . . We can guess at two methods used in this technique. The writer softens the egotistical character of the day-dream by changes and disguises, and he bribes us by the offer of a purely formal, that is æsthetic pleasure in the presentation of his phantasies.' That is surely a very significant admission—I mean: the admission that *purely formal* values in a work of art give pleasure. But Freud does not stop there: the work of art has other and more important functions. It is merely a bait to catch the poor fish, an 'incitement premium, or technically, fore-pleasure'. 'I am of the opinion', Freud concludes, 'that *all* the æsthetic pleasure we gain from the works of imaginative writers is of the same type as this 'fore-pleasure', and that the true enjoyment of literature proceeds from the release of tensions in our minds'. So we are back to the dynamics of the artistic event, back to a therapeutic theory of art.

In a paper of 1911, 'Formulations regarding the two principles in mental functioning', Freud gave further support to Rank, but in terms of the pleasure- and reality-principles. 'Art brings about a reconciliation of the two principles (pleasure and reality) in a peculiar way. The artist is originally a man who turns from reality because he cannot come to terms with the demand for the renunciation of instinctual satisfaction as it is first made, and who then in phantasy-life allows full play to his erotic and ambitious wishes. But he finds a way of return from this world of phantom, back to reality; *with his special gifts* he moulds his phantasies into *a new kind of reality*, and men concede them a justification as valuable reflections of actual life. Thus by a certain path he actually becomes the hero, king, creator, favourite he desired to be, without pursuing the circuitous path of creating real alterations in the outer world. But this he can only attain because other men feel the same dissatisfaction as he with the renunciation demanded by reality, and because this dissatisfaction, resulting from the displacement of the pleasure-principle by the reality-principle, is itself a part of reality.'[8]

This is virtually the same formulation as Freud made in the *Introductory Lectures* of 1915–17[9]—the passage beginning 'There is, in fact, a path from phantasy back again to reality, and that is—art'—a passage too familiar to be quoted in full. Again, it is mainly a question of the dynamics of the creative process in the artist, and we are given no clue to the problem of æsthetic values. But in drawing a contrast between the artist and 'those who are not artists', Freud suggests that the artist is exceptional in that he knows how to elaborate his day-dreams, 'so that they lose that personal note which grates upon strange ears and become enjoyable to others; he knows

[7] *Der Künstler*, 4th ed. (Vienna, 1925), p. 50.
[8] *Collected Papers*, Vol. IV, 1925.
[9] Eng. trans., 1922, pp. 314–5.

too how to modify them sufficiently so that their origin in prohibited sources is not easily detected. Further, he possesses the *mysterious ability* to mould his particular material until it expresses the ideas of his phantasy faithfully; and then he knows how to attach to this reflection of his phantasy-life so strong a stream of pleasure that, for a time at least, the repressions are outbalanced and dispelled by it.' But all this mysterious ability, according to Freud, has only one object—to win honour, power, and the love of women.

This is a very general theory, and before commenting on it I would like to draw attention to one further contribution of Freud's to the subject—his paper on 'The Moses of Michelangelo', originally published in 1914. It is notable in the first place for its disclaimers. 'I may say', begins Freud, 'that I am no connoisseur in art, but simply a layman. I have often observed that the subject-matter of works of art has a stronger attraction for me than their formal and technical qualities, though to the artist their value lies first and foremost in these latter. I am unable rightly to appreciate many of the methods used and the effects obtained in art.[10] But in the course of the essay Freud goes on to affirm that the reason why this statue of Michelangelo has attracted him so strongly must lie in the artist's intention. 'In my opinion', he says, 'it can only be the artist's intention, in so far as he has succeeded in expressing it in his work and in conveying it to us, that grips us so powerfully. I realize that it cannot be merely a matter of intellectual comprehension; what he aims at is *to awaken in us the same emotional attitude, the same mental constellation* as that which in him produced the impetus to create.' 'Emotional attitude', 'mental constellation'—those are phrases which at first sight might seem to correspond with the phrases I have already used—presentational immediacy, the pattern of sentience. But that is not what Freud means: he refers to 'the apparently paradoxical fact that precisely some of the grandest and most overwhelming creations of art are still unsolved riddles to our understanding', but he adds that it would only be with the greatest reluctance that he could bring himself to believe that the appeal of a work of art is dependent on 'a state of intellectual bewilderment'. A work of art must have a meaning that can be revealed by analysis; we must be able to *interpret* it.

Freud proceeds to interpret the 'Moses' of Michelangelo, and his interpretation is a classical example of the fallacy of identification. That is to say, in order to interpret this particular work, Freud first identifies himself with the sculptor, to discover what his intention might have been, and then assumes that the sculptor, in order to arrive at the form of his work of art, identified himself with his subject, Moses. Incidentally, on the basis of this double process of identification, Freud is able to criticize Michelangelo for not being faithful to the text of the Bible, and for falsifying the character of Moses. Michelangelo, he concludes after his analysis, 'has added something new and more than human to the figure of Moses; so that the giant frame with its tremendous physical power becomes only a concrete expression of the highest mental achievement that is possible in man, that of struggling successfully against an inward passion for the sake of a cause to which he has devoted himself.'

Such a subjective interpretation is based, not on the formal qualities of the work of art, but, as I have said, on an identification of the critic with the subject-matter of the work of art; and if we ask why Freud should have felt an impulsive attraction to this particular subject, and should have mistaken this attraction for the æsthetic value of this particular work of art, we find the answer in Freud's last work: *Moses and Monotheism.* 'It was one man,' Freud wrote in that book, 'the man Moses, who created the Jews. To him this people owes its tenacity in supporting life; to him, however, also much of the hostility which it has met and is meeting still.'[11] As a Jew himself, Freud was forcibly aware of the psychological significance of the historical Moses; an artist who ventured to give expression to this significance was touching Freud on the quick. For that psychological reason the Moses of Michelangelo held him in its grip. 'How often', he says, 'have I mounted the steep steps of the

[10] Cf. C. G. Jung, 'Picasso' (Papers of the Analytical Psychology Club of New York City): 'When I dare to express myself at all on the subject of Picasso, it is with the express reservation that I have nothing to say on the question of his "Art", but only on the psychology of his art. I put aside as well the question of æsthetics, as the problem of those learned in this direction, and limit myself to the psychology underlying the work of art itself.' Nevertheless, the general implication of this essay is that 'the attempts of a schizophrenic to express himself' have nothing in common with 'beauty', and it is clearly implied that Picasso is schizophrenic.

[11] Eng. trans. by Katherine Jones, London (Hogarth Press), 1939, p. 169.

unlovely Corso Cavour to the lonely place where the deserted church stands, and have essayed to support the angry scorn of the hero's glance! Sometimes I have crept cautiously out of the half-gloom of the interior as though I myself belonged to the mob upon whom his eye is turned—the mob which can hold fast no conviction, which has neither faith nor patience and which rejoices when it has regained its illusory idols.' Emotive language, but not, allow me to insist, the language of art criticism.

We can no longer avoid a direct questioning of the whole process of *identification*. I have no intention of denying that it takes place in æsthetic appreciation; we may have to admit that a species of identification is the necessary preliminary to the æsthetic apprehension of a work of art. But identification is not enough, as a simple example will show. It comes from the latest work to discuss the relationship between psycho-analysis and art—a book by Daniel E. Schneider [12] published a few months ago in New York. First let me give Dr. Schneider's description of the process of identification as it occurs in art:

' Every artist then must accept the challenge of rigorously accurate thinking—the challenge of attracting, immobilizing, forcing identification upon and " sending " his audience through his art form, giving them no alternative but to " act out " implicitly his interpretation as it swings through conflict, crisis, climax and resolution. This is true for all art. The audience must be drawn in and overcome. It buys its ticket for such substitutive pleasure, and, if cheated of that, it will manifest its hostility by attack or indifference—by " staying away in droves ". That the pleasure derived from art form is in part very close to sexual pleasure (though more diffuse and not actually participating—except as audience) cannot be denied by anyone, otherwise we should all prefer to listen to spiritual lectures, and Broadway would become a Mecca for other purposes than its present ones. There would be no need for art form and its intricacies. But art is always outlet, always " acting out " of interpretation. That is the way the true becomes the beautiful.'

The audience must be drawn in and overcome . . . that is the way the true becomes the beautiful—not, you will observe, the way the beautiful becomes the true. Having elaborated this hypothesis, Dr. Schneider proceeds to the analysis of various works of art, among them Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Mr. Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*. Incidentally it should be observed that the theory of identification is most easily and most frequently illustrated from the drama or from fiction—very rarely from the plastic arts and music. Dr. Schneider has no difficulty in showing that both *Macbeth* and *Death of a Salesman* are magnificent works of art, and judging by the relative degree of enthusiasm aroused in him by each of these works, it would seem that *Death of a Salesman* is a somewhat better work of art than *Macbeth*: there is no escape for the transfixed audience—it is ' sended ' (? ' sent '—I do not know how to conjugate the verb) as never before in the history of drama.

But is *Death of a Salesman* as great a work of art as Shakespeare's *Macbeth*? It seems to me that Dr. Schneider is bound to answer ' yes—even greater '. But I for one, and I think the majority of literary critics, can only regard such a judgement as absurd. Using the same criterion we should have to conclude that Conan Doyle was a greater writer than Henry James; and that the latest Peter Cheyney is far ahead of *Paradise Lost*.

It may be a case of false identification. Freud already distinguished three types of identification [13]—' first, identification is the original form of emotional tie with an object; secondly, in a regressive way it becomes a substitute for a libidinal object tie, as it were by means of the introjection of the object into the ego; and thirdly, it may arise with every new perception of a common quality shared with some other person who is not an object of the sexual instinct. The more important this common quality is, the more successful may this partial identification become, and it may thus represent the beginning of a new tie.' Freud goes on to suggest that the mutual tie that binds a group together is an identification of this kind—a common identification with the leader. He also ' suspects '—he goes no further than this—that ' we are faced by the process which psychology calls empathy (*Einfühlung*) and which plays the largest part in our understanding of what is inherently foreign to our ego in other

[12] *The Psychoanalyst and the Artist*. By Daniel E. Schneider. New York (Farrar, Strauss & Co.), 1950.

[13] *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. Trans. by James Strachey. Ch. VII. London (Hogarth Press), 2nd Edn., 1940.

people '. Now empathy is a term that has been much used in æsthetics—it goes back to Volkelt and Robert Vischer, that is to say, to the 1870s—and long before Freud's time was used to describe Freud's second, and possibly third, kind of identification. But in æsthetics the object of identification is not limited, of course, to ' some other person ', or even to a representation of some other person, but can be a plastic object, the essential æsthetic feeling being provoked, however, only when the object is a significant symbol.

It seems to me that Dr. Schneider has ignored, or drastically simplified, the complexity of the process of identification, and really confuses empathy with Freud's first type of identification —the emotional tie with the object typified in the Œdipus situation. It is significant that *Death of a Salesman*, like *Hamlet*, is a play about an Œdipus situation, so no wonder it unconsciously grips a Broadway audience. And no doubt *Hamlet*, as Dr. Ernest Jones was the first to show, has gripped successive generations for a similar reason. But what we have to realize is that a good play—a good work of art of any kind—can grip the public, not for the wrong reason, but for a reason that has nothing to do with æsthetics, nothing to do with beauty or art. Hamlet has survived, but thousands of plays that gripped their audiences in their day are now forgotten, and I believe that *Death of a Salesman* will one day be forgotten. What is the difference? It is simple. *Hamlet* is poetry; *Death of a Salesman* is probably not even good prose.

Dr. Schneider's view of art is not quite so crude as I have so far made it out to be. He uses some curious phrases—in one place he refers to the ' masturbatory haze ' of art which recoils from the task of making itself ' a thing of joy to others '. But he does make a distinction between the content and the form of the dream, and by implication (for he follows Rank in identifying the dream and the work of art) between the content and the form of the work of art. ' What makes the form of the dream,' he says, ' and, as we shall see, the form of art itself is, in addition to its identifications, the power of its economy, the power to combine the manifold " associative radiances " of the symbols in such a way as to enable the analyst (and artist) to interpose rational connecting links and so to " translate " to the dreamer (or to an audience), in logical thought, what one has been unconsciously feeling and thinking, and had suppressed so that it appeared in a dream.' In other words, the work of art is a dream condensed into logical or even rational form, and made objective. In the process the dream, of course, is deprived of its basic sexuality, but it ' stimulates and discharges psychic tensions '. In this way the work of art is made to fit into the dynamics of the psyche. It is a buffer between impossible impulses and reality, between primitive instincts and morality. Its ' form ' is the most effective organization of this impact.

A theory which shows much more respect for ' the mysterious ability ' of the artist (the phrase, you will remember, is Freud's) is that put forward recently in two papers contributed to the *British Journal of Medical Psychology* by Dr. Anton Ehrenzweig.[14] Dr. Ehrenzweig distinguishes between two types of perception—surface perception and depth perception. These two processes are said to occur simultaneously in different layers of our mind. ' Our depth mind, obeying the archaic pangenital urge, projects a sexual meaning into any form perceived, while our surface mind counteracts this projection by projecting, in its turn, an æsthetic (" good ") Gestalt into the external world.' In this way Dr. Ehrenzweig is able most ingeniously, and even convincingly, to combine the Freudian and the Gestalt theories of art. The unconscious sexual symbolism is the basic material of art, but this crude material is elaborated, to the degree of dissimilation, by our conscious feelings of beauty. A similar distinction was made by Dr. Fairbairn, in the papers to which I have already referred. He distinguishes between over-symbolization and under-symbolization—between the true work of art and those false works of art which do not function either because (1) ' the censorship of the artist's super-ego is so rigorous, and necessitates such an elaborate disguise of the urges expressed, that the work of art is deprived of almost all symbolic significance for the beholder '; or (2) the opposite case, ' when the artist's super-ego is weak and his repressed urges are really " urgent ", these urgent urges express themselves in the work of art with a minimum of disguise '. Then ' the object is not sufficiently symbolic to pass the censorship of the super-ego. It is, so to speak, too like the real thing '.

[14] **21**, 185–214; **22**, 88–109.

Dr. Fairbairn then puts forward a principle of ' optimal synthesis '. The artistic activity ' performs the double function of providing a means of expression for the repressed urges of the artist and of simultaneously enabling his ego to pay a tribute to the supremacy of his super-ego, the work of art . . . essentially represents a means of restitution, whereby (the artist's) ego makes atonement to his super-ego for the destruction implied in the presence of repressed destructive impulses '. ' The under-symbolized work of art fails to produce the effect of restitution because the impression which it gives is one of more or less unmitigated destruction. . . . On the other hand, restitution is meaningless apart from the presupposition of destruction; and, consequently, over-symbolization precludes the effect of restitution by excluding the impression of destruction too vigorously.' So it is a case of not too much and not too little, and the work of art, like the Hegelian synthesis, becomes ' the highest unity . . . reached through the full development and reconciliation of the deepest and widest antagonism '. In Freudian terms, the æsthetic experience ' depends upon the resolution of an antinomy created by the simultaneous operation of the libido (the life principle) and the destructive urges (the death principle) '. Hence the importance, in any work of art, of producing an impression of " the integrity of the object ", in other words, of beauty; and the validity of all theories, such as Goethe's, which emphasize the " serenity " of the work of art.

The advantage of these two theories is that they allow for a *scale* of values. As is well known, the Gestalt psychologists arrange the configurations of perception according to their degree of efficiency, and they have demonstrated that skill, and by implication craftsmanship and æsthetic form, is the ability to select those configurations which are relatively the most effective. Hence the " good " Gestalt. Dr. Ehrenzweig is quick to perceive that ' the new æsthetic principle guides perception to the æsthetically " best " Gestalt and teaches us to appreciate " abstract " form for *its own sake*, without regard to its possible rational significance '. This, in the psycho-analytical approach to art, is an immense step forward, for it not only gets rid of the ambiguous symbolism of representational forms, but even admits that abstract form, as elaborated by the artist, has an æsthetic value independent of its sexual motivation. Indeed, the dynamics of elaboration, the energy we put into creating æsthetic values, is determined precisely by the necessity to hide the sexual meaning of the original perception. I think that this theory possibly allows more freedom to the artist than is present in Dr. Fairbairn's theory of optimal synthesis. I do not suggest, however, that there is any contradiction between the integrity of the work of art, which according to Dr. Fairbairn would be compulsive, and the artist's freedom to elaborate the form of the work of art. The same impression of integrity could be produced by a variety of forms.

I would therefore like to suggest that we accept this correlation of the two forms of perception, and admit Dr. Ehrenzweig's further claim that even those so-called external laws of beauty which we find in natural forms—crystals, flowers, trees, etc.—may be included in pan-genital symbolism. After all, these laws are incorporated in the human body, and the sexually most attractive human form is possibly the one that best illustrates these external laws of beauty. It is an unconscious realization of this geometry of love that gives some of the early paintings of Chirico their mysterious attractiveness.

The only point I want to reserve against Dr. Ehrenzweig's theory is a question of a difference of degree, which becomes for all practical purposes a difference of kind. Dr. Ehrenzweig, in his evolutionary sweep, can imagine a ' pan-genital crisis when the maddened voyeur libido was deprived, through the erect human gait, of the sight of the female genitals and projected a " pan-genital " significance into any object of the external world '. At that stage all forms acquired a sexual significance, and the new æsthetic principle was evolved as a kind of fig-leaf. All works of art are but species of fig-leaves. We must envisage a process that lasted for millions of years, and is not yet complete. My point is, that at some stage in this historical process the art of propagating new varieties of fig-leaf becomes an intensive activity. The French æsthetician, Henri Focillon, invented the concept of ' la vie des formes ', the life of forms, and he showed, in many historical examples, how art forms meet and multiply and breed new forms. I think it would be difficult to prove that this propagation of art-species had any direct correspondence to variations in sexual significance. In other words, while we may freely admit the basic

"pan-genital" significance of art considered as a mode of symbolic expression, the values to which we attach most importance as artists and æstheticians are values of formal elaboration, and our excitement is due more immediately to formal variations on a theme, than to the original significance of the theme itself. The psycho-analyst will retort that this only proves the overwhelming need of our sophisticated civilization to get as far away as possible from the archaic pan-genital urge. Possibly; but my point is that when you get far enough away, the fish has become a fowl. It exists in another element.

If the fish swims in the pan-genital ocean, what then is the quality of the air that our bird-artist breathes? No one, I recognize, will be content with any up-to-date version of the play theory of art. The life of forms is no more, and no less, purposeless than life itself. We must in the end assume that form-elaboration has a biological purpose. We can follow Dr. Rickman and see in this play a reflection of the interplay of the creative and destructive forces of nature. 'When we discern the influence of creation predominating we are moved by something we call beauty, when we see destruction we recoil at the ugly. Our need for beauty springs from . . . our wish to find in art evidence of the triumph of life over death.'[15] This corresponds fairly closely to my own theory, but I do not favour such neat antitheses as beauty and ugliness, life and death. I prefer to keep to the evolutionary myth, and to see in art the test, the *exercise* of an expanding consciousness. Consciousness, particularly self-consciousness, and the ethical sense that comes with it, is an evolutionary acquisition of man. As a phenomenon it has never, as far as I know, been satisfactorily explained in terms of the survival of the fittest, or of the triumph of life over death. An increasing apprehension of the nature of reality, or of being, is about as near as we can get to a definition of its purpose. In the growth of that apprehensive faculty, art has been the essential means, the instrument for refining the apprehending sensibility.[16] Without the creative arts there would have been no advance in myth or ritual, in language or meaning, in morality or metaphysics.

* * *

It may seem that I have been a little grudging in my attitude to psycho-analysis. That is not my intention. I am anxious to protect art and the artist from misinterpretations, and there are many such misinterpretations about—not only psychological misinterpretations, but also political, moral and even æsthetic misinterpretations. But in the end I think we must admit that our debt to psycho-analysis is incalculable. I would say that this new science has come to the aid of the philosophy of art in two ways, which are really two stages of application. The first stage was to show that art could have hidden symbolical signification, and that the power of art in a civilization was due to its expression of the deeper levels of the personality. We thus obtained a scientific justification for our belief that art was more than a representation of appearances. But the second stage was more important—psycho-analysis has proved that the significance of the symbol may be, indeed generally is, hidden; and that the symbol as such need not be representational—it can be super-real, it can be completely geometrical or 'abstract'. This justifies the freedom of the artist. We had, merely as philosophers, come to the conclusion which Susanne Langer has expressed in these words: 'The first task of the artist is always to establish the primary illusion, i.e. to close the total form and set it apart from reality.'[17] For this determination we have been criticized by Marxist politicians and academic reactionaries, but we know instinctively that such 'setting apart' was not dilettantism, escapism, or esotericism. Now psycho-analysis has shown that our instincts were right; that the process of symbolic transformation which is fundamental to the creative process in art is also biologically fundamental: the necessary transformation of the archaic into the civilized, the passage from the id to the super-ego. This means, in historical or evolutionary terms, that art is symbolization from the beginning—in Susanne Langer's words

[15] 'On the Nature of Ugliness and the Creative Impulses', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **21**, 3, p. 20.
Cf. Harry B. Lee, 'The Values of Order and Vitality in Art', *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, II, p. 245.

[16] To interpret art as 'a manifestation of man's cognitive capability' may be another way of expressing the same idea: but what makes the capability? The psycho-physiological school reduce art to a functional activity of the brain cells, but do not explain what induces these cells to behave in such a peculiar way. Cf. F. Reitman: *Psychotic Art* (1950), p. 167. I have developed my own views in the Conway Memorial Lecture for 1951 ('Art and the Evolution of Man'), London (Freedom Press), 1951.

[17] *Hudson Review*, **3**, 2, p. 230.

again, 'form is first, and pictorial meaning is read into it'. Imitation is never the main motive. 'The primary interest is always design, and the very measure of an artist is his instinct for transforming his actual perceptions into wholly plastic elements as he works with them.' [18] The philosopher is content to define works of art as symbols for the articulation of feeling, as patterns of sentience. The analyst has more to tell us about those feelings, and about the biological significance of the patterns we articulate. Let us welcome his contribution to our knowledge of the dynamics of the creative activity; and then let us return to the studio where the forms of art await our further elaboration.

[18] *Ibid.*, **2**, 4, pp. 528–9.

THE PAN-HEADED MOSES—A PARALLEL[1]

By EVA M. ROSENFELD, London

In collecting and preparing material for a psychological study of the function of the hand, I searched analytical and non-analytical literature for contributions to my subject, and naturally I came across Freud's work on the Moses of Michelangelo, where the significance of the movement of Moses' hand is the essential point. 'The whole meaning of human existence forced into the language of the living body' is Spengler's definition of Michelangelo's mode of expression. I will use here one example of this 'language of the living body' as it is contained in Michelangelo's Moses statue and in Freud's interpretation of it. The Essay dealing with the statue of Moses was published anonymously in *Imago* in 1914. It is noteworthy that it was written, or at any rate published, in the same year as the Essay on Narcissism, which was already approaching the problem of the artist, and in which the first definition of super-ego—namely the ego-ideal and its origin—received attention and elaboration. We shall touch on these problems later, when considering the historical figure of Moses the Lawgiver.

I included in my studies the significance of the posture of Michelangelo's figure of Moses as it is mirrored in the art critics' controversy on the subject, Freud's early essay on the statue, his later book *Moses and Monotheism*, and the relevant passages of the Bible, i.e. Exodus. As regards the Bible, I compared the Latin quotations of the Vulgate, which was the version known to Michelangelo, and the text of which he must have used for inspiration, with the German and English translations of the fifteenth and early seventeenth centuries, i.e. Luther's and the Authorized Version.

On this occasion I found a new explanation of some obscure points concerning both the meaning of Michelangelo's statue and the analytical meaning of the Moses legend. It was with the help of Freud's later and wider research on Moses, as we know it from his book *Moses and Monotheism*, that I was able to find an answer to some queries left unsolved in the earlier essay.

Now I must briefly refer to the position of Moses' body and hand in the statue. Instead of giving an accurate description, I shall quote a few authorities, and their differing opinions on the subject. In Freud's view, the position of Moses' right hand holding or pressing down his beard is the result of a conflict of feeling which is expressed in this movement. The impulse to get angry, to give way to passion, is overcome in favour of the self-control necessary to protect the Tables of Law from being broken. The Tables are carefully balanced under Moses' right arm, and would drop to the ground if that arm made any violent movement. 'It always delights me', says the author, 'to read an appreciative sentence about this "inscrutable and wonderful work of art", such as that it is "the crown of modern sculpture" (Hermann Grimm: *Leben Michelangelos*). For no piece of statuary has ever made a stronger impression on me than this. How often have I mounted the steep steps of the unlovely Corso Cavour to the lonely place where the deserted Church stands and have essayed to support the angry scorn of the hero's glance! Sometimes I have crept cautiously out of the half-gloom of the interior as though I myself belonged to the mob upon whom his eye is turned—the mob which can hold fast no conviction, which has neither faith nor patience, and which rejoices when it has regained its illusory idols.' 'But why call this statue inscrutable? There is not the slightest doubt that it represents Moses, the Lawgiver of the Jews, holding the Tables of the Ten Commandments. That much is certain, but that is all.'

That no other work of art in the world has been judged so diversely as 'the Pan-headed Moses'[2] is in itself evidence to us of its manifold unconscious meanings and possibilities of

[1] Paper read before the British Psycho-Analytical Society on October 18, 1950.

[2] An expression used to describe the Moses of Michelangelo by the art critic Max Sauerlandt (1912) as quoted by Freud in his essay *The Moses of Michelangelo* (1914).

interpretation, and this alone makes the statue a most important source of stimulation for the student of psycho-analysis.

We come now to the various sources of controversy as Freud quotes them one by one. Moses' facial expression has of course aroused the greatest differences of opinion. The art critic Thode reads in it 'a mixture of wrath, pain and contempt: wrath in his threatening contracted brow, pain in his glance, and contempt in his protruded underlip and the down-drawn corners of his mouth.' A Frenchman, Dupaty, says that 'his august brow seems to be but a transparent veil only half concealing his great mind'. Please note here the use Dupaty makes of the word 'veil', which we shall find again later in the Bible.

The controversy also turns on the problem of whether the statue represents a specific dramatic moment at all, or whether it is not rather 'a timeless study of character and mood'. Apparently most of the judges have decided that the statue represents a highly significant moment in Moses' life, namely the moment when he descends from Mount Sinai, where he has received the Tables of Testimony from Yahveh, and when, while descending, he perceives that the people have in his absence forsaken the Lord, have disobeyed their leader Moses, have made themselves a Golden Calf, and are dancing round it and worshipping it. I quote now from Freud's own summing up:

> This is the scene upon which his eyes are turned, this the spectacle which calls out the feelings depicted in the countenance—those feelings which in the next instant will launch his great frame to violent action. Michelangelo has chosen this last moment of hesitation, of calm before the storm, for his representation. In the next instant Moses will spring to his feet—his left foot is already raised from the ground—hurl the Tables to the ground, and let loose his rage upon his faithless people.

So far the controversy has been limited to the question of the occasion, and of the feeling expressed on the occasion. Freud is the first to introduce the concept of conflict into this controversy, and he comes finally to the following conclusion: 'The figure of Moses, therefore, cannot be supposed to be springing to his feet; he must be allowed to remain as he is in sublime repose like the other figures and like the proposed statue of the Pope. But then the statue we see before us cannot be that of a man filled with wrath, of Moses when he came down from Mount Sinai and found his people faithless and threw down the Holy Tables so that they were broken. And, indeed, I can recollect my own disillusionment when, during my first visits to the church, I used to sit down in front of the statue in the expectation that I should now see how it would start up on its raised foot, hurl the Tables of Law to the ground and let fly its wrath. Nothing of the kind happened. Instead, the stone image became more and more transfixed, an almost oppressively solemn calm emanated from it, and I was obliged to realize that something was represented here that could stay without change; that this Moses would remain sitting like this in his wrath for ever.'

'Moses sitting like this in his wrath for ever'—this is my point, that in describing the statue of Moses, the anonymous author had given a preliminary semi-poetical forecast of his later scientific ideas on super-ego formation. Twenty-four years later, in *Moses and Monotheism*, these ideas found the following expression:

> He—the great man—is a father substitute, and we need not be surprised if he is allotted the role of super-ego in mass-psychology. This would, therefore, hold good for the man Moses in his relationship to the Jewish people.

We have now arrived at the crucial point of the controversy: which dramatic moment is it that Michelangelo intended to portray in the statue? Is it (*a*) Moses the scorning angry man, or (*b*) Moses the silent meditating spirit? We know Freud's own opinion, which differs from most of the popular ones. He sums it up as follows: 'He (Moses) remembered his mission and renounced for its sake an indulgence of his feelings; his hand returned and saved the unsupported Tables before they had actually fallen to the ground. In this attitude he remained immobilized and in this attitude Michelangelo has portrayed him as the guardian of the tomb.'

Freud used mainly the position of the hand and the beard as support for his theory: I shall discuss now a third point which may throw more light on the problem, the horns on Moses' head. What do the two mysterious horns mean? In the Latin text of Exodus, the Vulgate, we find the following relevant sentence: 'When Moses descended from Mount Sinai, he held two Tables of Testimony and he did not know that his face was horned from speaking with God' ('*quod cornuta esset facies sua ex consortio sermonis Domini*'). Neither

the English nor the German translations of the Bible include this strange reference to the horn which is contained in the Vulgate, and thus a most beautiful and symbolic error, which persisted throughout hundreds of years, has disappeared through rational thinking. How could such a strange error ever have arisen?

Theodor Reik in his deep-searching book *Ritual* has already drawn attention to this strange error of the beam-horn problem in great detail. In the Supplement: *The Moses of Michelangelo and the Events on Sinai* he deals exhaustively with the origin of the legend on Mount Sinai. His point is the overcoming of the dreaded bull-god [3] and Moses' founding of the Yahveh religion; and Reik comes to the same conclusions which you will shortly hear from me as regards the equation of the symbols 'horn' and 'beam'. Where Reik's and my further investigations go apart is in the fact that he pursues the problem of the founding of the Moses religion after the killing of the totem god and the totem feast, whereas I am going to deal with that aspect which becomes clear through Freud's later investigations and of which we read in his book on *Moses and Monotheism*, namely the legend that Moses was murdered and hence the fact that he himself was identified with the God whose power he had established for the Jewish people on Mount Sinai. Thus our paths of investigation meet and part again, both coming to the conclusion that parricide occurred. Reik sees in Moses the victor over the ancient god; I follow the line of how Moses, the leader, became Moses the mythical and heroic figure of whom Freud says that he was in later times identified with the god whom he had created. As regards parricide, Reik elaborates the idea that the totem god was killed by Moses on Mount Sinai, whilst I (following Freud) shall concentrate on the theory that the Jewish people killed Moses after his return from Mount Sinai.

The striking fact that in Hebrew the word for 'horn' and 'beam' should be the same is in itself a portentous phenomenon in so far as it allows us to see the development of religion mirrored in a linguistic change.

The original Hebrew says 'the face of Moses sent forth beams', which could equally be interpreted as 'the face of Moses was horned'. This was actually translated into Latin as 'the face of Moses was horned' ('*cornuta esset facies sua*') by St. Jerome, who translated the Vulgate from the Hebrew in the fourth century. Some ten to twelve hundred years later Luther and the King James translators both chose the other alternative: 'Moses wist not that his face shone whilst speaking with God'. (It is interesting to note that they dropped the word *beam* and replaced it with *shine*, and the English translators dropped the causal connection between speaking with God and growing horns and translated the phrase as 'whilst speaking with God' instead of '*from* speaking with God'.) To us the linguistic equation of beam and horn is not difficult to accept: what had been a totemistic symbol in one religious phase —the horn—might well have become a spiritual one in another religious phase—the beam.

Since the only Bible translation at Michelangelo's disposal was the Vulgate, he obviously knew only the word *cornutus*, which simply means 'horned'. It can be assumed, therefore, that he used this interpretation and thus provided us with a Moses in whom Antiquity and Judaism are welded together in the strangest way, or, as I would prefer to say, in which he has eternalized the moment when Judaism changed from polytheism, and in particular from idolatry, to monotheism.

As a scholar of oriental languages explained to me, the noun 'qéren' has undergone a semantic development both in an optical sense —horn, beam, in German *Strahl*, and in a functional sense—horn, might, potency, dominion. We would add that the semantic development of the word 'qéren' from horn to beam (optical), and from horn to might, potency, etc. (functional), has a psychological corollary in its development away from the conscious manifest meaning towards an unconscious latent meaning. That the horn is identified with the phallus becomes clearer as the linguistic development progresses further from the original meaning. The semantic development in the functional sense from horn to potency is only superficially a development

[3] Theodor Reik: *Ritual* (The Shofer (The Ram's Horn), Chapter VI. The Moses of Michelangelo and the Events on Sinai, p. 320): 'According to the unanimous pronouncements of Biblical scholars, the cast image represents a god, and the god, moreover, of early Judaism, which must have been similar to that of neighbouring peoples. How strongly the cult of the bull was spread among the Jews and what a lasting effect it exercised is best seen from the fact that images of a bull in Bethel and Dan enjoyed divine honours under Jeroboam I, and that the prophets, especially Hosea, directed their bitterest attacks against the worshippers of the bull.'

away from the original: actually it links up with it again, and the word potency has two meanings, the original sexual, concrete one, and the derived religious abstract one.

If we accept the explanation that the ' horns ' are a linguistic mistake for ' beam ', a mistake which has prevailed for centuries, then the second problem is easily solved, the problem of the moment of law-giving in which the *Moses cornutus* was immortalized by Michelangelo. Since he carries the Tables of the Law, he must have just come down from Mount Sinai, and since his face shines, he obviously has horns—beams—to crown it.

Now let us take the evidence of the Bible itself. Here we read of Moses coming down from Mount Sinai *twice*,[4] which curiously enough has escaped the attention of all the authors concerned. Or perhaps it is not so strange, because unless we understand the difference between the first and the second descent with the insight which psycho-analysis gives us, then the second story may well seem to be but a lengthy repetition of the first. This is not the case. The Bible says explicitly that when Moses came down from Sinai the first time he perceived the Children of Israel dancing round the Golden Calf. In his wrath he smashed the Tables of Law. He then took the Calf and burned it in the fire. Then he ground it to powder, strewed the powder upon the water, and made the Children of Israel drink it. My contention, following Freud's later theories, is that the two accounts of Moses' first and second descent from Mount Sinai show a deep divergence. I venture the hypothesis that between the first and the second descent, whether it was days, weeks, years or generations that lay between them, the legend conceals the fact that Moses had been murdered.

Now I shall try to prove that Michelangelo must have had in mind that second and final descent from Mount Sinai, where Moses is described as an apparition rather than as a man, and which is indicated by Michelangelo depicting him as the *Moses cornutus*. My point that the second descent was the moment of transfiguration is strengthened by comparison with the relevant passage about Christ's transfiguration in St. Matthew, ch. xvii:

> And after six days, Jesus bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them : and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And behold, there appeared unto them Moses . . .

If we cease reading the Bible story with our conventional memories of it, then the legend of Mount Sinai will suddenly seem quite incredible and full of enigmas of one kind and another. Why should Moses smash the Tables of the Law? Against whom had his anger waxed hot? Why did his wrath not turn against the culprits, instead of destroying that which he had got from his God—the token of Yahveh's mission for him?

It seems more likely, then, that the myth of the smashing of the Tables covers some major tragedy, or is even the last remnant of a legend of violence, for instance, that suggested by Sellin and developed by Freud, that Moses had been murdered while he turned his wrath against the Children of Israel. Their complaint to Aaron, recounted in the following passage from Exodus, would thus be an attempt to deny their guilt: ' And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the Mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron and said unto him: ' Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.'

This sounds very much like the answer which Cain gave to God after he slew his brother. When asked what had become of Abel, he answered: ' Am I my brother's keeper? '

It is important to note that the Children of Israel partook of the totemistic feast of drinking from the water on to which the Golden Calf had been strewn by Moses after he had destroyed it. The whole drama of rebellion and revolution which precedes and follows parricide may lie in this legend. The totemistic feast, the sharing of the sacrificial meal, is the only proof for such a theory, but, I believe, an acceptable one, especially when we take into account the existing theory that Moses was murdered.[5]

The Bible goes on to tell us that the Lord called Moses up again after the smashing of the Tables. He remained on Mount Sinai forty

---

[4] First Descent: Exodus xxxii. 19–20. Second Descent: Exodus xxxiv. 27–30.

[5] Exodus xvii. 3–4: ' And the people thirsted there for water, and the people murmured against Moses and said: Wherefore is this that has brought us out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto the Lord, saying, What will I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me.'

days and forty nights without eating or drinking. When he came down the second time, he brought once again the Tables of the Law. He found his people humble and repentant: he introduced the Ten Commandments: he reintroduced circumcision: in fact he founded the Jewish Yahveh religion as it stands to this day. Several events seem here to be telescoped into one: Moses' rebellion against God, the breaking of the Tables, the Children of Israel's rebellion against Moses, parricide and the totemistic meal, and the founding of the Yahveh religion.

Moses came down from Mount Sinai the second time with a light shining so brightly from his face that he had to veil it when talking to the Children of Israel, and could stand unveiled only before God. I would take this description as further evidence for the theory of transfiguration after parricide, for the theory that Moses was murdered, sacrificed, and then elevated to the rôle of leader. I would amplify this theory by saying that after the murder the Golden Calf was made and incorporated in his commemoration, and that his descent with the shining face was already myth, the apparition of the internalized father-image, the fantasy-creation of the guilty people, the image of their super-ego. I should like to quote here from *Totem and Taboo* (1950, p. 51):

> The question of why the emotional attitude towards rulers includes such a powerful unconscious element of hostility raises a very interesting problem . . . I have already hinted at the fact that the child's complex of emotions towards his father—the father-complex—has a bearing on the subject, and I may add that more information on the early history of the Kingship would throw a decisive light on it. Frazer (1911a) has put forward impressive reasons, though, as he himself admits, not wholly conclusive ones, for supposing that the earliest kings were foreigners who, after a brief reign, were sacrificed with solemn festivities as representatives of the deity.

(See in this connection also Freud's later idea that Moses was a foreigner, an Egyptian.)

The Tables which Moses brought down the second time were not, therefore, merely a replica of the original Tables of Stone which he had destroyed in his wrath: this time they were the Law itself, unbroken and unbreakable. To this moment the legend ascribes the founding of the religion of Yahveh. In his essay 'If Moses was an Egyptian' Freud also refers to the metaphorical meaning of the broken Tables. He understands the breaking of the Tables of the Law as symbolic—'he has broken the law'.

Thus we reach the conclusion that Michelangelo, if indeed he has taken and captured one particular moment, has depicted Moses' second descent, and not, as has been commonly thought, the first descent; though of course his work, like that of every artist, is like dreamwork where every aspect of the subject is used and represented at the same time. The first descent contains all the *external* drama of the smashing of the Tables and the Golden Calf, which would obviously make a good subject for a dramatic statue. But, judging from the description of Moses' second descent, of his face being horned, sending forth beams, it seems probable that Michelangelo chose the *internal* drama of the man Moses. The expression in Moses' eyes points to this: that expression of *terribilità* which has often been mentioned in connection with Michelangelo's figures, and which has found its greatest perfection in the face of Moses. To this day every onlooker may well experience the emotion which the Children of Israel experienced: 'Behold the skin of his face shone and they were afraid to come nigh him.' Freud confessed to a similar feeling when he said that he felt like creeping away from the angry scorn of the hero's glance.

So I would suggest that the image of Moses hewn in marble by Michelangelo's master hand represents the Children of Israel's internal image of their murdered father, transfigured, 'sitting there in his wrath for ever.'

I return to Freud's interpretation of the movement of Moses' right hand, and I suggest an additional meaning, taking into account the two aspects of Moses after his second descent as mentioned in the Bible, i.e. that he veiled himself when talking to the Children of Israel, and he unveiled himself when standing before God. I should like to suggest that Michelangelo used the hand and the beard to dramatize the movement of veiling and unveiling, and that the beard, which is part of the body, and yet a flowing and flexible thing, was chosen by the artist to solve the problem of portraying in stone the act of veiling and unveiling. We could then say that the moment which Michelangelo caught was not only that of conflict between impulse and sublimation of impulse, but was still more that of transition from the earthly to the divine figure, from the living man to the spiritual hero.

There is in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* an

interesting passage on the bishop's headwear, the mitre, which, I believe, supports my opinion. Here we read that the consecrating prelate blesses the mitre and places it on the head of the newly consecrated bishop, just as God set ' the horns of divine brightness and truth ' on the brow of Moses on Mount Sinai. The sides of the mitre are stiffened, and when it is worn they rise in front and behind like two horns pointed at the tips (*cornua mitræ*). Finally the mitre, though a liturgical vestment, differs from the others in that it is never worn when the bishop addresses the Almighty in prayer. He takes it off when he turns to the altar, and places it on his head again when he turns to address the people. Compare this with the act of veiling and unveiling. We then see how the Church made use of the *Moses Cornutus* by dramatizing a symbolic act whose unconscious meaning has thus been given a rationalized significance. As we see it now, the shine (beam) on Moses' face reveals the hero God: the horns on his head betray the Idol Calf.

And now to my last point, which is the historical one of the relationship between Michelangelo and his master Pope Julius II. It would no longer seem to us to be sufficient to discuss a work of art without taking into account the artist himself, and his external and internal situation. We would feel that we had not fully explored the avenues which could lead us ' from the surface to the depth '. In the case of the tomb for Julius II which Michelangelo was commissioned by the Pope himself to execute during his lifetime, we possess very ample and detailed sources of information in letters, eye-witnesses' accounts, and the research of contemporary and modern historians. All biographers of Michelangelo have emphasized the relationship between sculptor and Pope as a very passionate and intricate rivalry between two master minds. We need have no hesitation in saying that here a son-father relationship reveals itself before our eyes, a relationship recalling in all its implications that of Moses and Yahveh. In the actual story of the two human beings, Michelangelo and Julius, a deadly enmity alternated with a passionate devotion and allegiance. Julius commissioned Michelangelo to carry out the work of his great tomb: envious rivals whispered in Julius' ear that it was unwise to have one's tomb made during one's life-time.

It seems that the Pope became the prey of his fear of the murderous sons. Quite suddenly he refused Michelangelo the money to carry on with his gigantic project, for which far-reaching preparations had been made. Huge blocks of marble had been selected by Michelangelo in Carrara and transported with great expense to Rome. Taking the analogy of the Bible story, we might say that Michelangelo's anger ' waxed hot '. Nothing is more deadly for the artist than a last-minute frustration of all his plans, hopes and ambitions. How Michelangelo must have longed to smash the stone on which he had begun to work—and not the stone alone!

He actually flees from Rome. The Pope is angry, and sends his riders to pursue him. Michelangelo refuses to return. But later he does return: he atones, the Pope forgives, and in the end the work continues.

This in short is the story of the commission. We must remember that the work was commissioned for Julius' tomb, and that the figure of Moses, the leader, was selected, surely in reverence to Julius, the ambitious leader of the Catholics. The choice can only have been dictated by admiration and veneration. We see that there is really no end to the analogies. The struggle between son and father, as old as mankind itself, rages between these two great minds. What could be more natural than that after their reconciliation Michelangelo chose as a figure for the tomb the final covenant between Yahveh and Moses? And as it *is* a tomb, which means that it is the one final opportunity for paying homage to a man, would it not be most natural that Michelangelo should have honoured his Pope by showing him as another Moses, the leader of a people, standing after his death with his shining face unveiled before his God, the only one superior to him?

In this connection I may mention the opinion of Thode, as quoted by Freud in *The Moses of Michelangelo*:

> Michelangelo has created not an historical figure but a character type, embodying an inexhaustible inner force which tames the recalcitrant world: and he has given a form not only to the biblical narrative of Moses but to his own inner experiences and to his impression of the individuality of Julius himself.

Historical Conclusions

The passages in the Bible describing the two descents from Mount Sinai reveal two different figures of Moses, of which I suggest that the second is represented in the Moses of Michelangelo. These two biblical descriptions coin-

cide with Freud's theory about the two figures of Moses, since they relate to the two different persons whom Freud sees depicted in the legendary man called Moses in the scripture.

The first, according to Freud, is a man (possibly of Egyptian descent) who, after having accepted the new monotheism introduced by Amenhotep IV, became the leader of a Semitic tribe that had settled in Northern Egypt a long time before. He led them out of the country and into the desert, and was, according to Sellin and Freud, killed by the Jews.

The second Moses, a later and still more legendary figure, is the one who introduced Yahveh to the Jewish people. Yahveh gradually became the truly monotheistic Jewish God. Religious and political reactions induced the priesthood to attribute this monotheism to the Lawgiver Moses, and to identify the man who led the people out of Egypt with the man who gave them monotheism in its final Jewish form. The second Moses of the Bible story, the one who came back from his second ascent of Mount Sinai with his face shining, the Moses portrayed by Michelangelo, would then, according to Freud, be the one to whom later generations attributed the whole merit of the introduction of true monotheism.

As regards the problem of duality, Freud says in *If Moses Was an Egyptian*:

> I may now express my conclusion in the shortest formula: To the well-known *duality* of that history —*two peoples* who fuse together to form one nation, *two kingdoms* into which this nation divides, *two names* for the Deity in the source of the Bible— we add two new ones: the founding of *two* new religions, the first one ousted by the second and yet re-appearing victorious, *two* founders of religions, who are both called by the same name Moses and whose personalities we have to separate from each other. And all these dualities are necessary consequences of the first. . . .
>
> I may now say that we have added another duality to those Freud propounded: the *two legends* of Mount Sinai.

Psycho-analytical Conclusions

Freud's Essay of 1914 was a contribution to an existing controversy, but it very soon transcended the sphere of this controversy and, in fact, as I have tried to show, it touched on questions which were not to be answered until 1938, when he completed the final chapter of *Moses and Monotheism*. Who was Moses? His figure stands on the threshold between myth and history, between hero and man, between polytheism and monotheism. How many figures of Moses did there exist? Almost every humanistic science has had some light to throw on this problem. Oriental scholars have established the fact that the Jewish poet who wrote the Moses legend in about 900 B.C. was called the Yahvist, because it was through him that the name Yahveh was crystallized as the name of the only Jewish God. Philologists have helped to solve the problems of language roots; anthropologists, historians, artists, and now finally psycho-analysts, have all made their contributions. I have tried to give examples of each type. I must not, however, fail to quote two psycho-analytical contributions, one of which came to my knowledge only after I had drafted this paper. It is by Leonard Sillman, and was published in Vol. 30, Pt. II, 1949 of the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* under the title ' Monotheism and the Sense of Reality '. As the title shows, its conclusions are similar to mine, and the author discusses the problem in a very profound and scholarly way. His thesis is the cultural function of monotheism, and he illustrates the interesting fact that by stipulating an invisible, spiritual God who is everywhere and nowhere, the Jewish religion has laid the foundation for atheism, science, and the development of intellectual thought.

The second contribution is a substantial and very interesting book in German by Ewald Rollenbleck, to whose spiritual underground work during the Hitler *régime* it bears witness. It is called *Die Magna Mater im Alten Testament*. Its thesis, founded on a wide study of sources of Jewish folklore and of the Bible, sets out to prove, I think very convincingly, the existence of a Mother Goddess concealed in the figure of Yahveh. Although this thesis is very pertinent to my argument, I have not been able to give it the consideration it deserves, because it would widen too much the scope of this paper.

The fact that Moses has left such a tremendous mark on Western civilization, and yet is a figure about whom we know so little and have to surmise so much, makes his history a good background for studying a composite and transient phase in the history of the individual, namely the transient phase of myth and truth. If we take the Old Testament as a whole, we see that it has only one theme from beginning to end: the battle of monotheism, the fight against polytheism and idolatry, or, in analytical

terms, the struggle to establish and consolidate the super-ego. Moses is the founder of the conception of the Only God, and it is in the Prophets some 800 years later that the idea of the spiritual God seems finally to triumph. The psycho-analytical analogy might be that of the father's voice in early childhood, as opposed to the voice of the super-ego after the passing of the Œdipus complex. Of Moses' rôle in the developmental stages of his epoch, Freud writes in *Moses and Monotheism*, Chapter IV, ' The Progress in Spirituality ', (*a*) that Moses has de-materialized God, (*b*) that he has initiated the study of the laws of God, (*c*) that this development towards spirituality has been fostered by his prohibition against worshipping God in a visible form. Here a subtle but powerful link is established —as I see it—between super-ego formation and the growth of the intellect. The final formation of the super-ego marks the same step in the development of the individual as the final establishment of monotheism marked in the history of the Jewish people. With the super-ego law begins, and where there is law you can foretell the future. The intellect can help you to overcome fear, because the consolidation of law strengthens the sense of reality and, contrarily, every breakdown of law brings about a recurrence of earlier chaotic fears.

Freud once said that science was the greatest hope of mankind because it strengthens the primacy of the intellect. Science is above all the method by which laws are established and uncertainties overcome. Recent research has dealt more and more with the period of lawlessness in the child's development, as it deals with a pre-intellect phase, hence with a phase of less sense of reality and more anxiety. The threshold between myth and truth, the confusion between subjective and objective, the belief in, and fear of, internalized objects, as described by Mrs. Klein, correspond in my view to the phase of polytheism which precedes monotheism. The state of religion before monotheism, which we can read behind the Moses legend, is then, following this comparison, similar to the phase in the individual which precedes the supremacy of the super-ego.

We know that one important step towards establishing scientific facts can be made by drawing parallels with the findings of other scientific disciplines. Freud has done this with anthropology and ethnology, mainly in three works: *Totem and Taboo*, 1912; *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, 1921; and *Moses and Monotheism*, 1938. The parallel that first occurred to him arose from investigations into three categories of individual: the neurotic, the child, and the primitive man. The stipulation of this scientific fact has become a fundamental guiding principle in psycho-analytical research.

We have, as yet, no comparable parallel as regards the findings and axioms of those phases of childhood to which Mrs. Klein has given her main attention. Her parallels are so far confined to those between the first two of the above-mentioned categories—the mentally disorganized adult and the mentally unorganized child. Primitive man, and in particular his religious beliefs, have not yet, to my knowledge, been used by her to throw light on her clinical discoveries. The chief common characteristic of the three categories is in the lack of a sense of reality; in other words the absence of the critical faculty of the intellect, of the law of cause and effect. What makes the study of primitive man so important to us, is that he knows, so to speak, the reasons for his beliefs and fears. Their invalidity in the light of ' reason ' enables us to form hypotheses and draw conclusions about the nature of the other two categories, the child and the neurotic or psychotic.

I propose now, on the basis of my research into the legend of Moses' descent from Mount Sinai, to draw a parallel between an early phase in the development of the child, and the development towards monotheism in the history of religion. The early phase I would then equate to polytheism and idolatry; the later phase to the overcoming of both those, and to monotheism. If this is so, if the development of monotheism out of polytheism has its parallel in the life of the individual, then this parallel consists of the development of the super-ego phase out of the—if I may so call it—internalized objects phase.

I felt hesitant to put forward such a definition on my own authority, and I consulted once more Mrs. Klein's essay on *Mourning and its Relation to Manic Depressive States*, 1940. Here I found the following passage:

> This assembly of internalized objects becomes organized together with the organization of the Ego, and in the higher strata of the mind it becomes discernible as the super-ego.

Whereas Mrs. Klein uses the picture of an inner world and its higher strata, i.e. a concept

of layers in the mind, I used for my idea of an internalized object phase a concept of time. Since both pictures are taken from analogies with geology, the problem of space is really at the same time a problem of time. What is earlier, we usually think of as being deeper, lower down. What is later, is higher up. So I think I am justified in speaking of an internalized object phase. Nothing gets lost in the psyche, of course; it goes under, is covered up, but it is none the less there. The 'after' is the higher layer, the 'before' is the deeper one. It is here where I think my parallel with religious development becomes useful. The assembly of internalized objects is a picture of an unorganized multitude—polytheism: the super-ego is a concept of an organized entity—monotheism.

Freud's ideas on religion are well known to us. Since he proves that the primacy of the intellect is opposed to, and incompatible with, religion, he drops the analogy after the passing of the Œdipus complex, and places religion thereafter alongside the neurosis of the individual, calling it a general shelter for undefined individual neuroses (my own wording). It is at this point that he stresses his hope that the primacy of the intellect, through its ever more penetrating thought processes, will ultimately abolish the need for the doubtful solace of religion.

If we turn now to the research topic of object relations, as chosen and described by Mrs. Klein, we can see at once where the two regions of research part company. We can follow up the analogy of object relations with religion a good deal further. Both our object relations and our religious beliefs obviously do not come under the laws established by the primacy of the intellect. They are intrinsically unsuitable for subjection to this primacy. Mrs. Klein gives very impressive descriptions of this fact. She says that the child does not hear 'the father's voice', as I formulated it previously, but that it hears innumerable voices—good, bad, friendly, hostile—all depending on the interplay of its feelings. Religious beliefs are really the first, and unscientific, attempt to discover the laws which lie behind this fact. In monotheism an attempt is made to prove the law of ethical values, to prove that everything that happens to you is either an answer to your efforts to please God, or a punishment for having displeased Him, and it tells you how this has come about. It is somewhat similar to the 'Triebverzicht', the renunciation of impulse gratification acclaimed by the super-ego. In mythology we find again the colourful picture of the child who, in his narcissism, exaggerates his belief in his power to control his gods, and hence his fears of having offended them. The concept of internalized objects seems to me best explained in a parallel with mythology. The super-ego is an immobile force, 'something that can stay without change', as Freud put it. Its final victory is celebrated in monotheism. The internalized objects are the mobile unit, now external, now internal, threatening, promising, suffering, persecuting, never static, in continuous flux.

In his great work *Folklore in the Old Testament*, Frazer studies the earliest phases of religion, legend and law. These studies seem to me very pertinent to any research into the earliest religion of the child. It is its first supreme relationship with its mother which, we all agree, is the prototype of all later object relation patterns. The child has not merely many gods and idols, but it sees its first God, the mother, in innumerable guises.

Let us now return to my starting point—the momentous happening on Mount Sinai. Here it was that for the first time in Jewish and Western civilization the spiritual became the real, and what seemed real, 'The Gods of Gold, of Iron and of Stone', were reduced to the fantastic. Myth and truth changed places. The realization that the voice of conscience comes from within was a step towards scientific fact and the establishment of the primacy of the intellect. I believe that here a semantic development has occurred in our science which has already led to serious misunderstandings. Freud speaks of 'internal' as a spiritual space: Mrs. Klein, taking into account the child's budding materialistic thought processes, uses 'internal' mostly as a physical place, meaning 'in the insides' as the primitive man often does. With the primacy of the intellect 'internal' gradually became a concept, meaning the spiritual space from which the commandments or prohibitions are felt to come.

In the same paragraph where Mrs. Klein speaks of the assembly of internalized objects, she goes on to discuss this very problem of verbal formulation. She says: 'Thus the phenomenon which was recognized by Freud, broadly speaking, as the voice and the influence of the actual parents established in the ego is,

according to my findings, a complex object world, which is felt by the individual in deep layers of the unconscious to be concretely inside himself, and for which I and some of my colleagues therefore use the term ' internalized objects ' and ' an inner world '.

A most perfect artistic presentation of this internal object assembly in its normal aspects comes from Shakespeare in his *Midsummer Night's Dream* (first printed in 1600). What a picture he paints of this pining and searching, losing and finding, which is typical for the immature child's mind and to which all men return when they are in love! Shakespeare wisely places this Midsummer Night's assembly in Greece, and he makes Puck the Pan who leads the dance. Which one of the objects represented by the poet is meant to be internal, which external, is difficult to say. But what we understand when we read it is that to be in love makes man a child again, silences the voice of the super-ego and suspends temporarily the primacy of the intellect. Wall, moonshine and lion, fairies, people and clowns are all of equal import. They either harbour or conceal the god, the beloved one. Frazer gives a very analogous picture in his definition of polytheism, namely of it being the phase when animism is overcome and when the god becomes an independent mobile spirit, no longer entirely identified with the place in which he resides.

The saying goes: ' Rome was not built in a day '. We can certainly say that monotheism did not spring into being in the moment on Mount Sinai, although for dramatic reasons the poet shows it as so happening. We know equally well that the super-ego force does not seize the child's mind in a flash. Each phase develops gradually, even though dramatically, and retains traces of the epoch which it supersedes. Moses, the genius who brought to the Jews the conception of the One God, appears on Michelangelo's statue with a polytheistic symbol, the horns on his head.

What makes the Renaissance such an important field of research is that it is the revival of Antiquity, in the framework of Christianity, expressed through the medium of art. It marks the return of the cultural ideals of a polytheistic phase within the existing cultural ideals of the Christian phase, and it is near enough historically for us to understand the symbols it uses.

When such invasions of archaic forces occur in full force in the life of the individual, they threaten to destroy its mental organization. When they occur in the realm of politics and religion, then wars are waged and crusades carried out. While Savonarola preached damnation and hell-fire, Michelangelo and Leonardo were peacefully engrossed in their artistic and scientific pursuits.

Only in art, therefore, do we seem to go unharmed and unpunished when a former phase—religion, god, belief—I don't quite know what to call it—reappears beside a new one. We look once more at Michelangelo's statue of the inscrutable Moses with the head of Pan, and confess that we find in art the consolation and release from fear that neurosis and sometimes religion cause us.

But even the dancing Pan had an earlier and more frightening aspect before the Olympian phase of Greek mythology. By his unexpected appearance he was said to inspire men with sudden terror—hence the expression ' panic fear '; he has furnished some of the attributes of the ordinary conception of the devil. There is a legend coinciding with the birth or death of Christ, that a mighty voice proclaimed that ' Pan is dead '. It was thought to herald the end of the old world and the beginning of the new.

The wild god Pan and the immovable Yahveh:
Michelangelo the artist holds them both.

(Received, December 4, 1950.)

REFERENCES

Buber, Martin (1947). *Moses.* Oxford (East and West Library).

Burckhardt, Jacob (1944). *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy.* Transl. S. G. C. Middlemore. London (Phaidon Press).

Cotterill, H. B. (1913). *Ancient Greece.* London (Harrap).

Frazer, J. G. (1926). *The Worship of Nature,* Vol. 1, London (Macmillan).

Frazer, J. G. (1918). *Folklore in the Old Testament.* London (Macmillan).

Freud, S. (1950). *Totem and Taboo.* Authorized Translation by James Strachey. London (Routledge and Kegan Paul).

—— (1914). ' The Moses of Michelangelo ', *Collected Papers,* **4,** p. 257.

—— (1927). *The Ego and the Id.* London (Hogarth Press).

FREUD, S. (1940). *Moses and Monotheism.* London (Hogarth Press).

GRIMM, HERMAN (1901). *Leben Michelangelos.* Berlin and Stuttgart (Spemann).

KLEIN, MELANIE (1940). 'Mourning and its Relation to Manic-Depressive States', *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis 1921–45*, p. 311. London (Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis), 1948.

FLINDERS PETRIE, W. M. *Egypt and Israel.* London (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge).

RÖLLENBLECK, EWALD (1949). *Die Magna Mater im Alten Testament.* Darmstadt (Claassen und Röther).

REIK, THEODOR (1931). *Ritual, Psycho-Analytic Studies.* With a preface by Sigm. Freud, translated by Douglas Bryon. London (Hogarth Press).

HASTINGS, JAMES (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.*

SCHWAB, GUSTAV (1947). *Gods and Heroes.* London (Routledge).

SILLMAN, LEONARD (1949). 'Monotheism and the Sense of Reality', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **30**, pp. 124–132.

SPENGLER, OSWALD (1926). 'Gestalt und Wirklichkeit', *The Decline of the West.* New York (Alfred A. Knopf).

UNTRANSLATED FREUD

(11) 'POSTSCRIPT TO MY PAPER ON THE MOSES OF MICHELANGELO' (1927) [1]

Several years after the publication of my paper on the Moses of Michelangelo, which appeared anonymously in *Imago* in 1914 (*Collected Papers*, **4**, 257), Dr. Ernest Jones very kindly sent me a copy of the April number of the *Burlington Magazine* of 1921 (Vol. XXXVIII), which could not fail to turn my interest once more to the interpretation of the statue which I had originally suggested. This number contains (pp. 157–166) a short article by H. P. Mitchell on two bronzes of the twelfth century, now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, which are attributed to an outstanding artist of that day, Nicholas of Verdun. We possess other works by the same hand in Tournay, Arras and Klosterneuburg, near Vienna; his masterpiece is considered to be the Shrine of the Three Kings in Cologne.

One of the two statuettes described by Mitchell, which is just over 9 inches high, is identifiable beyond all doubt as a Moses, because of the two Tables of the Law which he holds in his hand. This Moses, too, is represented as seated, enveloped in a flowing robe. His face is expressive of strong passion, mixed, perhaps, with grief; and his hand grasps his long beard and presses its strands between palm and thumb as in a vice. He is, that is to say, making the very gesture which I postulated in Fig. 2 of my former paper as a preliminary stage of the attitude into which Michelangelo has cast him.

A glance at the accompanying illustration will show the main difference between the two compositions, which are separated from each other by an interval of more than three centuries. The Moses of the Lorraine artist is holding the Tables by their upper edge with his left hand, resting them on his knee. If we were to transfer them to the other side of his body and put them under his right arm we should have established the preliminary posture of Michelangelo's Moses. If my view of the thrusting of the hand into the beard is right, then the Moses of the year 1180 shows us an instant during his storm of feeling, whilst the statue in S. Pietro in Vincoli depicts the calm when the storm is over.

In my opinion this new piece of evidence increases the probability that the interpretation which I attempted in 1914 was a correct one. Perhaps some connoisseur of art will be able to bridge the gulf in time between the Moses of Nicholas of Verdun and the Moses of the Master of the Italian Renaissance by telling us where examples of representations of Moses belonging to the intervening period are to be found.

---

[1] First published in German in *Imago* **13** (1927), 552–3; reprinted *G.S.* **11**, 409–10 and *G.W.* **14**, 321–2.

MOSES STATUETTE

attributed to Nicholas of Verdun. Copyright reserved by The University of Oxford, Ashmoleam Museum.

MOSES STATUETTE

illustrating Emilio Servadio's ' An Unknown Statuette of Moses' (pages 95–96).

AN UNKNOWN STATUETTE OF MOSES

By EMILIO SERVADIO, Rome

Several years ago I had the honour and the pleasure of translating into Italian Professor Freud's essay *The Moses of Michelangelo*.[1] It had never occurred to me that I myself would find something very important, corroborating Freud's main viewpoints.

It happened as follows. A well-known Roman amateur of art and music reviewer, Dr. L. E. Checchi, found by mere chance a copy of my translation (now completely out of print). Thereupon he wrote to me, hinting that he had something very peculiar to show me with reference to the celebrated statue. What he actually showed me when we met was really breath-taking.

It was the photograph of a statue which looked *almost exactly* like the *Moses*, but for the expression of the face—especially the eyes—which was indeed quite different from that which everybody knows. There were also many variations of detail, although on the whole the statue in the photograph resembled the *Moses* of Michelangelo as a well-executed model must resemble the finished work of art.

In fact, it was a model! So, at least, several prominent artists and sculptors had said—among them the famous Dupré. They had said, that is, that none other but Michelangelo himself could have made such an impressive *pièce*, which in the photo has the appearance of a gigantic sculptural figure, as everybody can see, although its length is hardly more than 8 inches.

Art critics in general, however, are of a different opinion. They all agree that this statuette is the product of a great sculptor—belonging possibly to the end of the sixteenth century. But they have the vaguest ideas as to who this sculptor might be. Some have suggested Della Porta; others, a pupil of Michelangelo himself. A few facts, in any case, must be taken into account: (1) the model, made of Roman plaster, is strikingly like the famous statue by Michelangelo; (2) it was undoubtedly made by a first-class artist; (3) it may belong to the second part of the sixteenth century; (4) it was found, though under what circumstances it has been impossible to ascertain, about 1840 in the countryside near Pisa by an Italian amateur (grandfather of the present owner), who was lucky enough also to find on his tour some unquestionable autographs by Michelangelo.

I have no authority whatsoever to say anything for or against the authenticity of the model. What seems to me of the utmost importance is the peculiarity of the expression of this Moses.

It can at once be seen that the statuette's face is that of an inspired and saintly man, not that of an angry leader. Whereas the face of Michelangelo's Moses is full of anger against the leaping Jews, that of the statuette seems to look imploringly towards Heaven, as if asking of God the relief and consolation which his people have refused him.

Now if the statuette is really a model from the hand of Michelangelo, the question arises whether the master has not put into his model something more than there is in the completed masterpiece. It is well known that, according to Freud, Michelangelo's Moses represents the final step of a hypothetical series of attitudes which Michelangelo himself may have unconsciously imagined. In fact, the great majority of art experts have concluded that the famous statue shows Moses at the moment when he is about to jump to his feet and destroy the Tables of the Law. But in Freud's opinion this is not true. First of all, Freud reminds the reader that this statue of Moses was meant to be one of a group for the sepulchral monument of Pope Julius II, and that such an attitude, therefore, would have been inconsistent with the pose of the other sculptures. Freud then turns to the much-discussed beard of Moses, and is able to show that the right hand of the statue is by no means 'deep down' in the beard, as nearly everyone says, but looks as if it were slowly receding and letting it go; the forefinger is the

[1] *Collected Papers*, Vol. IV.

only one which really exerts a pressure on the beard. Freud points out, furthermore, that the Tables seem to be in a very awkward position, as if only the forearm of the Prophet prevented them from falling. These elements—the beard, the right forearm, the Tables—are the mainstays of Freud's conclusions, which are the following: Michelangelo's Moses is checking and mastering his anger, he is not about to give vent to it. We may, Freud says, imagine the great statue as representing the third step of an emotional process: first, a calm stillness, Moses holding the Tables of the Law easily with his right hand and under his arm, his beard descending vertically like a hairy veil; second, the sight of the Golden Calf and the leaping Jews, Moses' hand in his wrath abandoning the Tables (which are now held by the arm only) and convulsively grasping his beard while his head turns to the left; third, the mastering of the passions: the Tables are prevented from falling and checked by the forearm until they find a support from below, the hand goes back from left to right and holds a part of the beard, which, however, is about to be relinquished; the head still shows pain and scorn. This, according to Freud, is the real attitude of the Moses of Michelangelo.

Is it possible, then, that in Michelangelo's unconscious a further step had been taken, and that in his model he has represented Moses as the Prophet and saint who, having finally subjugated his own emotions, looks up to God as the ultimate source of grace and fulfilment?

In that case, we might ask, did Michelangelo change his mind when he actually sculpted his masterpiece? To this question it is well-nigh impossible to reply. We may surmise perhaps that after having more or less consciously conceived the expression and mien of an inspired Moses, Michelangelo may have had second thoughts, and decided that the statue, after all, was to represent the energetic and temperamental Pope Julius II. To represent Julius as an imploring and inspired saint would very probably have been incongruous with Michelangelo's plan.

On the other hand, if the statuette is not by Michelangelo, there must yet have been an unconscious motive for the unknown sculptor's achieving the beautiful work with such skill and care, and purposely making it different from the original. The most obvious course would have been for the sculptor to copy exactly the Moses of Michelangelo, but he did not. Why? Is it too bold a supposition that the unknown artist, too, may have been somewhat dissatisfied with the puzzling attitude of the Moses (a puzzle which was solved only a few years ago), and may have tried unconsciously to show, as it were, to himself and to the public what the great Prophet might have looked like, had he achieved complete success in his struggle against his own anger, and sought refuge in God.

Be this as it may, it seems beyond doubt that the statuette, of which a photographic reproduction accompanies this article, is the most important contribution to the problem of Michelangelo's Moses, which has appeared since the publication of Freud's memorable essay.

(Received March 1, 1949.)

A DREAM, A VISION, AND A POEM:

A PSYCHO-ANALYTIC STUDY OF THE ORIGINS OF THE RIME OF THE ANCIENT MARINER [1]

By DAVID BERES, M.D., New York

The sanction for the writing of this essay comes to me from Samuel Taylor Coleridge, whose poem, *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, is at the same time the subject of my study. In his considerations of the nature of poetry, Coleridge said:

> What is poetry?—is so nearly the same question with, what is a poet?—that the answer to the one is involved in the solution of the other (1).

There is perhaps no poem in English literature to which this comment may more aptly be applied than to his own *Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. I shall attempt to demonstrate that in this poem there is the record and the augury of the life of a man—his conflicts, his fears, and his hopes. And it can only be because his conflicts and fears and hopes are not basically different from those of other men that the poem has for more than a century and a half continued to fascinate generations of readers.

The reader of a poem enters into a communal experience with the poet. It is not alone a common intellectual experience—it is a common emotional experience. The poet who with his genius has created with words the symbols and the visions of inner passions, joys and sorrows, permits the reader to recreate these feelings, to share in the genius. So do ordinary men reach great heights otherwise unattainable to them. It is this communal emotional experience that brings a poem into the province of the psychoanalyst.

John Livingston Lowes, in his remarkable book, *The Road to Xanadu*, has traced the sources of the imagery of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. He has demonstrated with mastery and conviction how Coleridge had submerged in the ' deep well ' of his mind the impressions of an omnivorous reading, and how these impressions reappear in the poem. A great part of this reading was in books about travel and discovery, subjects which absorbed the attention of the reading public of the time as they did the attention of Coleridge, who had not yet stepped out of the British Isles. Lowes describes with many examples the associative mechanism by which the poet brought to the surface of consciousness the memories which had been hidden for months or years. What Lowes calls the ' subliminal ego ' is familiar to the psycho-analyst as the activity of the preconscious mind.

The preconscious, which is but a short step from conscious awareness, becomes the frequent subject of literary scholarship in the elucidation of relationships not altogether on the surface. It is one level at which the meaning of an artistic creation may be studied, and leads to consideration of historical antecedents, philosophical concepts and metaphysical elaborations. It is the level at which the allegory becomes the meaning of the poem.

Lowes has refused to go further than his evidence permitted him, and he has set certain standards for those who attempt to seek for the deeper psychological factors behind the works of Coleridge or any other artist. He says:

> I suspect that psycho-analysis as applied to works of the imagination will gain the confidence of scholars only when the analysts master at first-hand the evidence which they employ. Then conclusions may at least be tested, and accepted or rejected or amended, as dispassionate consideration of the evidence decrees (2).

Lowes has carried the investigation of the origins of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* to a point which permits those who follow him, as I do, to look out upon a wider and clearer vista. From this vantage point I propose to

[1] Paper read before the New York Psycho-Analytical Society on May 16, 1950.

seek out the answers to those questions which Lowes leaves untouched, and to do so with full awareness of the standards he sets for such an investigation.

The psycho-analyst begins with the assumption that behind the creative act of the poet there lies an unconscious motivation. This does not mean that conscious factors do not also enter into the act, but the latter in the study of a poem are the province of the literary scholar and not of the psycho-analyst. The conscious and the unconscious factors combine to form a psychological unity which in a poem is an expression of the purest function of the human mind.

It is no longer necessary for the psycho-analyst to apologize for his studies of artistic creation. A path lighted by Freud, Sachs, and Jones is no longer a dark alley. But a few comments on methodology may be in order. The main purpose of this study is to understand the poet's phantasy in relation to his life-history, to seek out the unconscious motivations of his creative act. To achieve this I propose to search in the poem, in the artist's other creations, and in his life for evidence of unconscious psychic activity. I shall not attempt a full survey of the life of Coleridge and I shall leave untouched many questions which the *Ancient Mariner* raises. Nor do I intend to 'explain' the poem. Coleridge has warned us:

> Poetry gives most pleasure when only generally and not perfectly understood (3).

What I may add to the many interpretations of the poem since its publication in 1798 will leave unchanged the comment of a biographer of Coleridge: 'The proof of the purest poetry is that its meaning is inexhaustible' (4). This is in psycho-analysis the concept of over-determination.

I have already indicated that the analyst in emphasizing the rôle of the unconscious does not neglect the importance of conscious activity in the construction of a poem. Without conscious control and skill, the effusions which reach the preconscious and then the conscious from the unconscious of the poet may form striking images, vague impressions or elusive feelings. The conscious skill of the poet shapes these effusions into an artistic creation. Coleridge's testimony bears strongly on this point:

> Idly talk they who speak of poets as mere indulgers of fancy, imagination, superstition, etc. They are the bridlers by delight, the purifiers; they that combine all these with reason and order—the true protoplasts—Gods of Love who tame the chaos (5).

And Lowes makes it explicit that when Coleridge wrote the *Ancient Mariner* it was not in a state of emotional trance:

> But when he [Coleridge] wrote the *Ancient Mariner*, he was constructing on definite principles, with the clearest possible consciousness of what he was about, a work of pure imagination (6).

II

Coleridge wrote a short Argument as an introduction to an early edition of the *Ancient Mariner*, which summarizes the poem:

> How a Ship, having first sailed to the Equator, was driven by Storms to the cold Country towards the South Pole; how the Ancient Mariner cruelly and in contempt of the laws of hospitality killed a Sea-bird and how he was followed by many and strange Judgements: and in what manner he came back to his own Country (7).

The *Ancient Mariner* thus, we see, is the story of a voyage, a wandering; the theme that of crime, punishment and repentance.

The poem begins:

> It is an ancient Mariner
> And he stoppeth one of three.
> " By thy long grey beard and glittering eye,
> Now wherefore stopp'st thou me? "

The Mariner has a story to tell. He must tell it, and, as he says later, he cannot rest:

> And till my ghastly tale is told,
> This heart within me burns.

A ship sets out on a trip; its voyage begins 'with good wind and fair weather', but soon hits upon storms and reaches a land 'of mist and snow'. Quickly Coleridge reaches the dramatic episode of the poem. An Albatross appears, a creature, as he says in a gloss, 'received with great joy and hospitality':

> It ate the food it ne'er had eat,
> And round and round it flew.
> The ice did split with a thunder-fit;
> The helmsman steered us through!
>
> And a good south wind sprung up behind;
> The Albatross did follow,
> And every day, for food or play,
> Came to the mariners' hollo!

Suddenly the crime is committed.

" God save thee, ancient Mariner!
From the fiends, that plague thee thus!—
Why look'st thou so?"—With my cross-bow
I shot the Albatross!

It is an act without reason. And at once the Albatross begins to be avenged:

And I had done a hellish thing,
And it would work 'em woe.

His shipmates turn against him, but when the fog clears and the voyage goes on smoothly, they change their minds:

Then all averred, I had killed the bird
That brought the fog and mist.
'Twas right, said they, such birds to slay,
That bring the fog and mist.

The hate is justified. But it is only a short respite, and the true vengeance sets in.

Day after day, day after day,
We stuck, nor breath nor motion;
As idle as a painted ship
Upon a painted ocean.

Water, water, everywhere,
And all the boards did shrink;
Water, water, everywhere,
Nor any drop to drink.

The very deep did rot: O Christ!
That ever this should be!
Yea, slimy things did crawl with legs
Upon the slimy sea.

About, about, in reel and rout
The death-fires danced at night;
The water, like a witch's oils,
Burnt green, and blue and white.

His comrades turn againt him with even greater bitterness and place upon him the whole guilt:

Instead of the cross, the Albatross
About my neck was hung.

The skeleton ship appears; at first he thinks it brings them rescue, but instead it carries the avengers. He sees two figures:

And is that Woman all her crew?
Is that a Death? and are there two?
Is Death that woman's mate?

The punishment begins in earnest. His shipmates die. The ship is driven on by supernatural forces, and the Mariner who was won by the woman 'Life-in-Death' lives on to suffer loneliness and thirst. Coleridge says in a gloss, 'In his loneliness and fixedness he yearneth towards the journeying Moon,' and his loneliness is expressed in those wonderful lines:

. . . this soul hath been
Alone on a wide wide sea:
So lonely 'twas, that God himself
Scarce seemed there to be.

In the midst of this suffering the Mariner sees the creatures of the sea:

Beyond the shadow of the ship,
I watched the water-snakes:
They moved in tracks of shining white,
And when they reared, the elfish light
Fell off in hoary flakes.

And as he looks upon those creatures

A spring of love gushed from my heart,
And I blessed them unaware.

'The spell begins to break.' The Albatross falls from the Mariner's neck and sleep comes upon him.

Oh sleep! it is a gentle thing,
Beloved from pole to pole!
To Mary Queen the praise be given!
She sent the gentle sleep from Heaven,
That slid into my soul.

He dreams of 'Buckets . . . filled with dew.' He drinks in his sleep.

My lips were wet, my throat was cold,
My garments all were dank;
Sure I had drunken in my dreams,
And still my body drank.

Spirits come and guide the ship and bring it towards his home.

. . . The man hath penance done,
And penance more will do.

Until finally the curse is fully expiated, but not the Mariner's guilt:

Like one, that on a lonesome road
Doth walk in fear and dread,
And having once turned round walks on,
And turns no more his head;
Because he knows, a frightful fiend
Doth close behind him tread.

The ship comes back to its port.

Oh! dream of joy! is this indeed
The light-house top I see?
Is this the hill? Is this the kirk,
Is this mine own countree?

The pilot and the pilot's boy come out to the ship and they bring along the hermit.

> He'll shrieve my soul, he'll wash away
> The Albatross's blood.

The ship sinks in a last terrifying moment. The mariner is safe on land, but he must continue to wander, seeking a peace that never comes.

III

The genesis of *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* took place in circumstances which form a remarkable anecdote of English literary history. The story is best told in the words of William Wordsworth, who forty-five years after the poem was written dictated the following note to an admirer:

> In the autumn of 1797, he [Coleridge], my sister, and myself, started from Alfoxden pretty late in the afternoon, with a view to visit Linton, and the Valley of Stones near to it; and as our united funds were very small, we agreed to defray the expense of the tour by writing a poem. . . . Accordingly we set off, and proceeded, along the Quantock Hills, towards Watchet: and in the course of this walk was planned the poem of the 'Ancient Mariner', founded on a dream, as Mr. Coleridge said, of his friend Mr. Cruikshank. Much the greatest part of the story was Mr. Coleridge's invention; but certain parts I myself suggested; for example, some crime was to be committed which would bring upon the Old Navigator, as Coleridge afterwards delighted to call him, the spectral persecution, as a consequence of that crime and his own wanderings. I had been reading in Shelvocke's Voyages, a day or two before, that, while doubling Cape Horn, they frequently saw albatrosses in that latitude, the largest sort of sea-fowl, some extending their wings twelve or thirteen feet. 'Suppose', said I, 'you represent him as having killed one of these birds on entering the South Sea, and that the tutelary spirits of these regions take upon them to avenge the crime.' The incident was thought fit for the purpose, and adopted accordingly. I also suggested the navigation of the ship by the dead men, but do not recollect that I had anything more to do with the scheme of the poem (8).

The poem becomes then not the creation of Coleridge alone, but also that of two other men. The major contribution was of course that of Coleridge, but it would seem that his original conception of the poem was a vague one and that it was Wordsworth's contributions that gave it its dramatic unity. Of the three men two were poets: the third, John Cruikshank, was a neighbour of the Coleridges who served in this extraordinary collaboration as a representative of the ordinary man.

On July 14, 1844, Wordsworth attended a dinner party, given by a Mrs. Davy, of The Oaks, Ambleside, and in her reminiscences of this party she quotes Wordsworth as saying: 'We agreed to write jointly a poem, the subject of which Coleridge took from a dream which a friend of his had once dreamt concerning a person suffering under a dire curse from the commission of some crime' (9). We do not know whether Wordsworth's account truly records Mr. Cruikshank's 'curse' or whether it is a projection of his own inner conflict. Under any circumstances Wordsworth included the ordinary man in the creative experience. And when he wrote:

> Oh! many are the Poets that are sown
> By Nature; men endowed with highest gifts,
> The vision and the faculty divine;
> Yet wanting the accomplishment of verse;
> . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> . . these favoured Beings,
> All but a scattered few, live out their time,
> Husbanding that which they possess within,
> And go to the grave, unthought of (10),

he was admitting to his company and to that of Coleridge all who dream.

We come now to the questions which Lowes has not asked and which I must raise. Why did the dream of Coleridge's friend stimulate in him an immediate response in the form of a vision of a Wanderer on the oceans? Why did he choose the images that appear in his poem? Why did the theme of crime, guilt, and expiation occupy the mind of the poet? And what of Wordsworth? What did his suggestions of the shooting of the Albatross and the spectral persecution mean? Did Coleridge suffer only a diffuse guilt and was Wordsworth's crime a more specific one?

Shall we find in the lives of Coleridge and Wordsworth, and in the writings of these men, some clues to explain their preoccupation with crime, guilt and expiation? This is the task before us. We are fortunate that Coleridge was a prolific writer. He has left a wealth of data about himself in letters, notes, and prose writings, as well as in his other poems. In addition, Coleridge wrote some years after its origin a series of marginal glosses to the *Ancient Mariner* which serve as elucidative comments on the poem.

Most of this essay is concerned with Coleridge, but the rôle of Wordsworth in the writing of the *Ancient Mariner* requires that I also give considerable attention to him.

IV

Coleridge was twenty-six years old at the time that the *Ancient Mariner* was written. He was the youngest in a large family. His father, the Reverend John Coleridge, was chaplain-priest and vicar of the parish in a small village, Ottery St. Mary, and also master of the school in that town. Coleridge's mother was his father's second wife, and Samuel was the youngest of her ten children.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic of Coleridge's early life was his close attachment to his father, who was fifty-three years old when the boy was born. He spoke of his father as ' an Israelite without guile '. He was a kind and amiable man, though absent-minded, but withal so beloved that his eccentricities seemed only to increase the esteem in which he was held by his parishioners.

Coleridge wrote of his childhood:

> My father was very fond of me, and I was my mother's darling: in consequence I was very miserable. For Molly, who had nursed my brother Francis, and was immoderately fond of him, hated me because my mother took more notice of me than of Frank, and Frank hated me because my mother gave me now and then a bit of cake, when he had none,—quite forgetting that for one bit of cake which I had and he had not, he had twenty sops in the pan, and pieces of bread and butter with sugar on them, from Molly, from who I received only thumps and ill names.
>
> So I became fretful and timorous, and a tell-tale; and the schoolboys drove me from play, and were always tormenting me, and hence I took no pleasure in boyish sports, but read incessantly. . . . And I used to lie by the wall and *mope*, and my spirits used to come upon me suddenly; and in a flood of them I was accustomed to race up and down the churchyard, and act over all I had been reading, on the docks, and nettles, and the rank grass. . . .
>
> So I became a *dreamer*, and acquired an indisposition to all bodily activity; and I was fretful, and inordinately passionate, and as I could not play at anything, and was slothful, I was despised and hated by the boys; and because I could read and spell and had, I may truly say, a memory and understanding forced into almost an unnatural ripeness, I was flattered and wondered at by all the old women. And so I became very vain, and despised most of the boys that were at all near my own age, and before I was eight years old I was a *character*. Sensibility, imagination, vanity, sloth, and feelings of deep and bitter contempt for all who traversed the orbit of my understanding, were even then prominent and manifest (11).

Coleridge's father died when the boy was nine years old and a year later he was sent off to school. Coleridge did not return to visit his home for seven years; and his last visit to Ottery was in 1799, though his mother lived until 1809 when he was thirty-seven years old. There is reason to question his comment: ' I was my mother's darling.'

The paucity of information about Coleridge's mother is an amazing fact. In his early letters he tells us little of her: ' My mother was an admirable economist, and managed exclusively.' (12). That he considered himself somewhat more favoured by her than was his brother Frank, the next oldest, he has already told us. He tells in another letter of a vigorous fight with Frank in which ' I seized a knife, and was running at him, when my mother came in and took me by the arm ' (13). He expected a flogging and ran away, spending the night in a field by the river Otter—' thinking at the *same time* with inward and gloomy satisfaction how miserable my mother must be! ' He was found the next morning, and to the disappointment of the neighbour who found him he was not whipped. Only one letter to his mother has been preserved, written in 1785 from school. It is the sort of letter most schoolboys send their mothers about objects received and gives no hint of his effusive gift with words (14).

Another direct reference to his mother appears in a letter to a school friend, G. L. Tuckett, written in 1794, when Coleridge was hiding in the British Army under the name of Silas Tomkyn Comberbacke. It was an adventure that was of advantage neither to Coleridge nor to the British Empire. To Tuckett he wrote: ' Alas! my poor mother! What an intolerable weight of guilt is suspended over my head by a hair on one hand ' (15).

In 1799, after his marriage, Coleridge visited his family in Ottery St. Mary for the last time. Of this visit he wrote to a friend, Thomas Poole:

> I have three brothers, that is to say, relations by gore. Two are parsons and one is a colonel. George and the Colonel, good men as times go—very good men—but alas! we have neither tastes nor feelings in common (16).

To Poole in this letter he wrote, ' We hope your

dear mother remains well. Give my filial love to her. God bless her!' Of his own mother whom he saw on this visit there is not a word.

Shortly before his mother's death he complained in a letter to his brother-in-law, Robert Southey, that he could not visit her though she asked for him, because 'tho' my Brother knows that I am penniless, not an offer of a banknote to enable me to set off' (17). There is not in any of his writings, so far as I could find, any note of the death of his mother, a strange omission when we consider how easily and volubly he wrote on all that touched and moved him. This is not alone an omission; it is an accusation and a revenge. It becomes the more striking when we read in a letter which he wrote to Thomas Poole in 1801 when his friend's mother died:

> By a letter from Davy I have learnt, Poole, that your mother is with the Blessed. I have given her the tears and the pang which belong to her departure, and now she will remain to me forever, what she had long been—a dear and venerable image, often gazed at by me in imagination, and always with affection and filial piety. She was the only being whom I ever *felt* in the relation of Mother (18).

Actually this sentiment is not altogether true. There was in his life, as I shall demonstrate, at least one other person to whom he assigned the rôle of mother image.

What happened between the boy and his mother? He who was allegedly his mother's 'darling' could not so quickly give up that status without cause and without distress. No direct facts are available to explain this development in Coleridge's life. James Dykes Campbell, an early biographer, says of her:

> She was comparatively an uneducated woman, and unemotional; but was an admirable wife, mother, and housekeeper; and although she disliked 'your harpsichord ladies', determined to make gentlemen of her sons—an ambition in which their father was deficient (19).

James Gillman, a physician with whom Coleridge spent the last years of his life, says of Coleridge's mother:

> She was, I should add, a very good woman . . . over careful in many things, very ambitious for the advancement of her sons in life, but wanting perhaps that flow of heart which her husband possessed so largely (20).

In the last decade of his life Coleridge wrote of her to a nephew:

> . . . you are too well aware, how much our family (with the single exception of myself occasioned by my Father's sudden Death) owe to your Grandmother's maternal ambition, to condemn the same aspirations, the same forward-looking schemes and wishes in Mrs. Gillman. In whatever relationship these may stand to Self-love, it is impossible not to regard as more than venial an unconscious Selfishness, which seeks its gratification by every species of Self-denial, and by the enduring systematic Sacrifice of all immediate Self (21).

He reveals in this apology for his mother a sense of unlovedness, a need that manifested itself in a search for warmth, love and food. Food became the index of his well-being. He wrote about a school:

> At Hertford I was very happy, on the whole, for I had plenty to eat and drink, and pudding and vegetables almost every day (22).

But in a few weeks he left for another school in London, and here it was different:

> Our diet was very scanty. Every morning a bit of dry bread and some bad small beer. Every evening, a larger piece of bread and cheese or butter, whichever we liked. . . . Our food was portioned; and excepting on Wednesdays, I never had a belly full. Our appetites were *damped*, never satisfied; and we had no vegetables (23).

And to deny this hunger he turned to phantasy:

> Conceive what I must have been at fourteen; I was in a continual low fever. My whole being was, with eyes closed to every object of present sense, to crumple myself up in a sunny corner and read, read, read—fancy myself on Robinson Crusoe's Island, finding a mountain of plum-cake, and eating a room for myself, and then eating it into the shapes of tables and chairs—hunger and fancy! (24).

Never did Coleridge give up his need. The hunger that was in him was never appeased, and he remained dependent on external sources for his self-esteem. He wrote:

> O there are some natures which under the most cheerless all-threatening nothing-promising circumstances can draw hope from the invisible, as the tropical trees that in the sandy desolation produce their own lidded vessels full of the waters from air and dew! Alas! to my root not a drop trickles down but from the watering-pot of immediate friends (25).

Coleridge's basic character structure is revealed in these recurrent memories of food and hunger, the phantasies of satiation, the

unconcealed demands for love and admiration—a man who remained in his relationship to persons a never-satisfied, ever-demanding infant. Coleridge describes himself in terms that delineate with almost clinical accuracy the oral character defined by psycho-analysis. And Coleridge was not spared the conflicts that so often are the lot of such a character-structure. His unending search for love was expressed in many ways and his disappointments were often released in his poetry. In a poem entitled ' The Pains of Sleep ' he said:

> To be beloved is all I need,
> And whom I love, I love indeed.

At fifteen he sought the friendship of a cobbler and his wife and was so happy with them that he asked to leave school and be apprenticed to the cobbler. The master of the school responded by sending the cobbler away with some physical chastisement.

In an autobiographical note which I have quoted, Coleridge told us of his early habits of voracious reading and of his amazing memory. The oral significance of reading is intuitively confirmed by Coleridge in his phantasy of reading and eating out of a mountain of plum-cake a room and its furnishings for himself. These qualities in his schooldays earned for Coleridge a considerable popularity which he did not hesitate to exploit. He would absorb the current political pamphlets, and in his meetings with his fellow-students would, at the end of the day, disgorge his readings verbatim, amended with his own brilliant comments.

Already in his teens, Coleridge discovered that he could make people love him and want to help him. His characteristics of slothfulness and lack of application were soon manifested in his school work. He was always at the head of his class, ' though utterly without the desire to be so; without a spark of ambition ' (26). His dependence further demonstrated itself in his inability to handle money, and he developed the pattern of borrowing from friends and from his brothers. Always he hoped in some way to find his fortune in a projected work, and always he succeeded in borrowing money on the strength of his hope. Later in his life, when he turned down (temporarily) an offer of money from some friends, he said, ' Not that I am ashamed to receive—God Forbid ' (27). Not in his whole life did Coleridge succeed in breaking away from this pattern of financial dependence.

Also in his relations with women, Coleridge gave evidence of his basic infantile needs. He sought in love the protection of a mother. The image of the infant with its mother evoked from him some of his most tender lines:

> Thou closely clingest to thy Mother's arms,
> Nestling thy little face in that fond breast
> Whose anxious heavings lull thee to thy rest!
> Man's breathing Miniature! thou mak'st me sigh
> —A Babe art thou—and such a Thing am I!

As a schoolboy he began to write effusive love poems. To the daughter of a school nurse when he was ill on the wards of Christ's Hospital he wrote:

> In Beauty's light you glide along:
> Your eye is like the Star of Eve,
> And sweet your voice, as Seraph's song.

When he was twenty-one, he wrote ' The Rose ':

> Within the petals of a Rose
> A sleeping Love I spied.

He sees this love, it appears,

> And placed him, caged within the flower,
> On Spotless Sara's breast.

Sara was his wife, but earlier manuscript notes indicate that this last line has varied and has appeared in at least three different forms:

> On lovely Nesbitt's breast,

and

> On Angelina's breast,

and

> On spotless Anna's breast.

The emotion was constant—but the beloved varied. Later in his life in midst of the greatest intensity of his unhappy marital state he wrote to another unavailable woman a poem he called ' The Second Birth ':

> There are two births, the one when Light
> First strikes the new-awaken'd sense—
> The other when two souls unite,
> And we must count our life from then.
>
> When you lov'd me, and I lov'd you,
> Then both of us were born anew.

But all these loves were distant and ideal. When faced with a real woman Coleridge developed a frenetic state of indecision. He needed perspective to retain his romantic ideals. In a moment of flight he wrote, ' Love is a local anguish. I am sixteen miles distant, and am not half so miserable ' (28).

He became enamoured of a young lady by the name of Mary Evans when he was less than twenty. We may question whether the real object of his love was not Mary's mother whose ' tenderness scarcely inferior to the solicitude of maternal affection ' (29) brought out in him raptures that he never wrote to, or about, his own mother. In 1832, in an autobiographical note, Coleridge said of Mrs. Evans that she ' taught me what it was to have a mother. I loved her as such ' (30). His own mother was living at the time he was reminiscing about. His letters to Mary and her mother (written, of course, from a distance) were filled with a devoted love that disappeared when Coleridge found himself in the presence of his inamorata, and once when he chanced upon Mary and her sister while on a holiday trip, he hid in an inn so as not to be seen. Only when Mary was betrothed did he declare himself to her. Coleridge's idealization of Mrs. Evans, Mary's mother, may be understood as an attempt to resolve his unconscious ambivalent feelings towards his own mother, towards whom on a conscious level there were evident only his silence regarding her and his estrangement. Coleridge sought in his realistic contacts for persons to take the place of his mother, and in his attempt to resolve his ambivalent conflict he created images of the good mother and of the bad mother. Mrs. Evans is clearly the image of the good mother, and remained so to the end of his life. In the person of Mrs. Fricker, who was the mother of his wife, there are hints of the bad, hated mother (31).

In 1794 Coleridge, with some young enthusiastic friends, including Robert Southey, developed a plan for a Utopian colony in America, which called for marriage with similarly enthusiastic young women. In this scheme, which was called Pantisocracy, Coleridge was paired off with a young lady, Sara Fricker, toward whom he manifested no less indecision than in his relationship to Mary Evans. Though the Utopian scheme fell through, Coleridge married Sara in the manner so characteristic of the indecisive person who attempts to resolve his vacillation by an impulsive act. Only a few months before his marriage he wrote to Southey, who was Sara's sister's husband:

> Love makes all things pure and heavenly like itself,—but to marry a woman whom I do *not* love, to degrade her whom I call my wife by making her the instrument of my low desire, and on the removal of a desultory appetite to be perhaps not displeased with her absence! Enough! These refinements are the wildering fires that lead me into vice. Mark you, Southey! *I will do my duty* (32).

He did his duty, and married Sara Fricker in 1795 when he was twenty-three years old. Sara was a good person, but has gone down in history as ' a commonplace woman '.

The full story of Coleridge's unhappy marriage is too long to be told here. He was, by his own admission, irritable, complaining and demanding. There were frequent considerations of separation, but Sara did not permit it, in order to maintain the appearance of respectability, though she did not hide her dissatisfaction. We may perhaps owe to Sara's unconscious retaliation for her husband's rejection the lovely poem, ' This Lime-Tree Bower My Prison ', which Coleridge wrote because he could not join his friends on a long walk after ' dear Sara accidentally emptied a skillet of boiling milk on my foot ' (33). Coleridge spent his enforced rest writing this poem. Coleridge went off on many trips with his friends, particularly with Wordsworth. Sara had little part in these relationships. During a long absence in Germany with William and Dorothy Wordsworth, it was so apparent to everyone that Coleridge needed to be protected from ordinary responsibilities that he was not informed of the death of his son during his absence abroad until a month had passed. Away from Sara his letters were filled with expressions of his devotion, his need, his loneliness, and his guilt.

My conclusions about Coleridge's unhappy relationships with his mother, which I have gathered from his writings and his life, do not differ from those of his biographers. I make the point, however, that Coleridge did not permit his hostile feelings to his mother to come to the surface of his conscious mind. He repressed in his unconscious mind his conflicted ambivalent emotions about her, his crying need, his bitter frustration, and his guilt at the hate this must have engendered. His ambivalence was evident in the contradictions of his life. The repressed emotions and conflicts came to consciousness only in distorted and unrecognizable forms. They appeared in his relationships to other persons—his demands on people, his unrealistic loves and his distressing behaviour towards his wife. They appeared also in the symbolism and imagery of his poetry.

There is a parallel between the life of Coleridge

and the imagery of the *Ancient Mariner* which forces us to see in his symbols the expression of his unconscious conflicts. The Albatross, about whom so much of the dramatic action of the poem centres and who is the victim of the Mariner's crime, is introduced with a comment about food. The sailors feed it ' food it ne'er had eat '; it is to them a ' bird of good omen '. It is received with great joy and hospitality; but with the love there is an inexplicable hatred and with seeming purposelessness the Mariner shoots the Albatross.

Coleridge, in the introduction to the *Ancient Mariner* which I have quoted, speaks of ' the contempt of the laws of hospitality ' to which the Albatross is subjected, a phrase that appears again in a letter to a friend in which he tells of his reluctance to destroy the mice in his cottage. The content is striking for its clearly oral nature. He wrote:

> The mice play the very devil with us. It irks me to set a trap. By all the whiskers of all the pussies that have mewed plaintively, or amorously, since the days of Whittington, it is not fair. 'Tis telling a lie. 'Tis, as if you said ' Here is a bit of toasted cheese; come little mice! I invite you! ' when, oh foul breach of the laws of hospitality! I mean to assassinate my too credulous guests (34).

The danger of incorporating the bad object, the poisonous food, is strongly portended in this quotation. It is more than coincidence that the ' foul breach of the laws of hospitality ' which is a murderous act against the unsuspecting little mice becomes in the *Ancient Mariner* the ' contempt of the laws of hospitality ',

What does the Albatross symbolize? Do not the characteristics of the Albatross apply as well to the mother? Are not both creatures who bring protection and plenty? And after the Mariner kills the Albatross does he not seek justification for his act in the fact that it is no longer a bird of good luck, even as the hungry infant's love of the mother turns to rage and hate the moment that the milk ceases to flow from the breast? The mother in Coleridge's unconscious mind was a person whom he both loved and hated. Is the Albatross the symbol of the ambivalently loved mother? This is the central point of my thesis, and I must support it with further evidence.

It is the killing of the Albatross that gives substance to the guilt which pervades the poem, and even before Wordsworth brought the crime to focus by suggesting the killing of the Albatross we know that Coleridge had made the theme of the poem that of guilt. The source of his guilt could only have come from his unconscious mind. His sense of guilt is evident in many of his poems, as when he wrote:

> Such punishments, I said, were due
> To natures deepliest stained with sin,—
> . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> But wherefore, wherefore, fall on me?

The guilt was ready to break forth from his unconscious and needed but the stimulus of Cruikshank's dream to appear in the imagery of the *Ancient Mariner.*

But how does the Albatross-mother become a dangerous object, an object that must be killed? The answer must be sought in Coleridge's productions. His oral fixations prepare us for an unconscious conflict on a pregenital level with its characteristic aggressive content. It is useful to apply here Lewin's formulation of the ' oral triad of wishes '. Lewin says:

> . . . The idea of active orality—the wish to devour—must be studied in conjunction with its passive counterpart, that is, the wish to be devoured, and with the wish to go to sleep, and for convenience I shall refer to these three wishes together as the ' oral triad ' (35).

The active wish to devour has in the case of Coleridge already been demonstrated in his memories and phantasies of ' hunger and fancy '. The other parts of the triad require further elucidation. Does the danger in the Albatross-mother lie in the projection of the child's aggression, the fear of talion punishment? Does it lie in the fear of the passive wish, the impulse to be devoured? Does the killing of the Albatross-mother indicate an attempt to deny this passive wish?

Coleridge courted death, and he wrote of death as to a lover:

> Come, come thou bleak December wind,
> And blow the dry leaves from the tree!
> Flash, like a love-thought, thro' me, Death!
> And take a life that wearies me.

His last poem was an epitaph, and again he pleaded:

> That he who many a year with toil of breath
> Found death in life, may here find life in death!

And this ' Life-in-Death ' which he sought as an end to his suffering appeared already in his youth in the *Ancient Mariner.* She is the Spectre-Woman come to avenge his crime, the killing of the Albatross:

Her lips were red, her looks were free,
Her locks were yellow as gold:
Her skin was as white as leprosy,
The Night-mare LIFE-IN-DEATH was she,
Who thicks man's blood with cold.

She wins the Mariner from Death in the casting of the dice, and he is doomed to his eternal wandering, his death-in-life. The Nightmare Life-in-Death is both feared and desired. She is both Death and Life. She is the mother whom the poet has killed in his phantasy, and whom he must again restore to life, this time as an avenging person. In death he must join her to achieve peace and rest.

Coleridge has in this image of the Spectre-Woman shared with the makers of myths of all ages the awareness that the primitive mother of the unconscious mind is an object of love and hate, a giver of life and death. He has with poetic genius created a symbol of the ambivalently loved precœdipal mother. The symbol appears in other forms in several different poems by Coleridge. Before he wrote the *Ancient Mariner* he wrote an obscure poem, ' The Destiny of Nations ', in an early version of which appeared a few lines which were eliminated from later versions:

Aye bidding PAIN, dark ERROR'S uncouth
child,
Blameless Parenticide! his snakey scourge
Lift fierce against his Mother!

I do not know the exact meaning of these lines in their relation to the rest of ' The Destiny of Nations '. My only defence is that there appears in a volume of this poem, happily preserved in a museum, a manuscript note by Coleridge related to some other lines in the same poem, in which he admits a similar difficulty. He says:

These are very fine Lines, tho' I say it, that should not: but, hang me, if I know or ever did know the meaning of them, tho' my own composition (36).

Though Coleridge eliminated the ' blameless parenticide ' and ' the snakey scourge ' from the poem, the psycho-analyst cannot so readily permit the deletion. Can we utilize these phrases as associations to the *Ancient Mariner*? I shall return to these phrases, but first I shall consider another poem for further corroborative evidence.

At the same time that Coleridge was writing the *Ancient Mariner*, he was also working on a poem whose stature is second only to his masterpiece. This poem, *Christabel*, was never completed. Though he attempted to dismiss this poem in his later writings as ' a work, that pretended to be nothing more than a common Fairy Tale ' (37), there are in it some details which interest us and seem especially pertinent to our immediate question. The poem tells the story of Christabel, a noble lady whose lover is away and who meets in the woods near her home:

. . . a damsel bright,
Drest in a silken robe of white,

named Geraldine. Geraldine tells of being seized by warriors and begs Christabel to save her. But we are soon given to know that Geraldine is no ordinary woman, and when she comes into Christabel's bedroom and prepares to rest, a frightening vision ensues which works upon Christabel as a magic spell. Christabel knows she has been bewitched, and later tries to tell this to her father, Sir Leoline, but the magic charm prevents her. Sir Leoline prepares to return Geraldine to her father, who is supposedly his old friend. Nor will he heed the words of his bard who tells him of a warning dream:

For in my sleep I saw that dove,
That gentle bird, whom thou dost love,
And call'st by thy own daughter's name—
Sir Leoline! I saw the same
Fluttering, and uttering fearful moan,
. . . . . .
I stooped, methought, the dove to take,
When lo! I saw a bright green snake
Coiled around its wings and neck.
Green as the herbs on which it couched,
Close by the dove's its head it crouched;
And with the dove it heaves and stirs,
Swelling its neck, as she swelled hers!

When the vision first appeared in the bedroom, Christabel called upon her mother, who had died when she was born, to protect her, but Geraldine willed the mother's spirit away. What was the frightening scene in the bedroom? As Geraldine undressed:

Like one that shuddered, she unbound
The cincture from beneath her breast:
Her silken robe, and inner vest,
Dropt to her feet, and full in view,
Behold! her bosom and half her side—
A sight to dream of, not to tell!
O shield her! shield sweet Christabel!

What did Coleridge with his poetic intuition mean to transmit to his reader in this dim

vision? What did Christabel see as Geraldine disrobed? Who is this woman in white who comes to the motherless Christabel, is received with trust and responds with betrayal? When Christabel calls for her mother:

> ' O mother dear! that thou wert here! '

Geraldine replies:

> ' I would . . . she were! '

There is a struggle within the mind of Geraldine, who cries out:

> ' Off, wandering mother! Peak and pine!
> . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> Off, woman, off! This hour is mine—
> Though thou her guardian spirit be,
> Off, woman, off! 'Tis given to me.'

And when the spell is over Geraldine in a ' soft ' voice says:

> ' All they who live in the upper sky,
> Do love you, holy Christabel! '

The scene with Christabel under the spell of Geraldine is not one of horror:

> And lo! the worker of these harms,
> That holds the maiden in her arms,
> Seems to slumber still and mild,
> As a mother with her child.

Geraldine is a being torn by conflict; she is good and evil: she loves and hates; she is loved and hated. Is this not again the mother, who this time was killed by the child in the act of birth, returning to seek vengeance even as the Nightmare Life-in-death? Here in three different forms we find the ' blameless Parenticide ': the Mariner who shot the Albatross, Christabel who killed her mother in childbirth, and Coleridge who destroyed his mother in his unconscious mind.

That Geraldine is the mother image is also suggested in a symbolic reversal early in the poem as Christabel leads her into the castle:

> They crossed the moat, and Christabel
> Took the key that fitted well;
> A little door she opened straight,
> All in the middle of the gate;
> . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> The lady sank, belike through pain,
> And Christabel with might and main
> Lifted her up, a weary weight,
> Over the threshold of the gate:
> Then the lady rose again,
> And moved, as she were not in pain.

In this exquisite condensation, Geraldine is the mother in pain and also the child delivered through the portal; Christabel has repeated the birth process and has given new life to her dead mother.

Coleridge elaborated Geraldine's attributes in the bard's dramatic dream; the witch-mother becomes a ' bright green snake ' and in the embrace with the dove-child enacts a scarcely-disguised sexual scene:

> And with the dove it heaves and stirs,
> Swelling its neck, as she swelled hers!

Here again is the ' snakey scourge ' which ' dark ERROR'S uncouth child ' lifts ' fierce against his Mother '. The child denies his sexual wish and his guilt by reversing the process and by making the mother the aggressive, phallic person. Not only in the bard's dream but by direct allusion, Coleridge gives to Geraldine the characteristics of a snake:

> A snake's small eye blinks dull and shy;
> And the lady's eyes they shrunk in her head,
> Each shrunk up to a serpent's eye.

But only Christabel sees this vision and in her trance takes on also the snake-like qualities as she:

> . . . in dizzy trance
> Stumbling on the unsteady ground
> Shuddered aloud, with a hissing sound.

To others Geraldine appeared:

> . . . in maiden wise
> Casting down her large bright eyes,
> With blushing cheek and courtesy fine.

Only the guilt-ridden child sees the beautiful mother also as a monster. Here again Coleridge has revealed a deep unconscious truth; he has brought to the surface of consciousness the symbolic expression of the phantasy that the archaic mother of the unconscious mind is not only a creature of love and hate, of life and death, but also a creature who combines in the one person both male and female. He has recognized that the preœdipal mother is a phallic woman.

The two poems, *Christabel* and *the Ancient Mariner*, complement each other, and help to explain the detail in ' The Destiny of Nations '. The ' blameless parenticide ' which as a phrase appears without meaning to us in its original context becomes in this total reckoning the cry of innocence of a guilt-laden child.

Coleridge's fear of the phallic mother, towards whom he directed his passive wishes and upon whom he projected his aggression with the resultant guilt, created in him a conflict which he never resolved.

That Coleridge chose to represent the endangered child in *Christabel* as a woman is evidence of his own feminine tendencies, which entered into the pattern of his life. As his life went on he remained passive and defeated. He did not permit his hostilities to come to the surface. Only his guilt was all-prevalent, all-pervasive, ever diffuse. He saw his life as ' a prison without ransom, anguish without patience, a sick-bed in the house of contempt ' (38). I must postpone the study of Coleridge's unconscious conflict about his homosexual tendencies, for which there is strong evidence in his poetic imagery, as well as in his personal relationships, especially his friendship with Wordsworth. I must remind the reader that as the meaning of ' pure poetry ' is inexhaustible, so the complexities of a poet's mind are unending. The phallic symbolism in Coleridge's poems, which has already been discussed, indicates that his oral fixation was a post-phallic phenomenon, a manifestation of a regressive defensive process. My emphasis on the oral aspect of Coleridge's personality is dictated by the prominence of data in his productions bearing on oral conflicts.

After this long digression I return to the *Ancient Mariner*. His punishment was loneliness and hunger:

> Alone, alone, all, all alone,
> Alone on a wide wide sea!

and

> With throats unslaked, with black lips baked.

These are punishments that logically would follow the killing of the mother.

Coleridge introduces the phallic symbolism of the snake, which as in *Christabel*, suggests that the predominant oral content of the *Ancient Mariner* is a regression from a conflict at the phallic level. He sees ' a thousand thousand slimy things ', but he is at first unrepentant: ' He despiseth the creatures of the calm '. As his suffering does not abate, his attitude changes. The vision of the Moon, a symbol of the Mother, introduces the transformation: ' In his loneliness and fixedness he yearneth towards the journeying Moon ', and ' By the light of the Moon he beholdeth God's creatures of the great calm '.

> I watched the water-snakes:
> They moved in tracks of shining white,
> And when they reared, the elfish light
> Fell off in hoary flakes.
>
> Within the shadow of the ship
> I watched their rich attire:
> Blue, glossy green, and velvet black,
> They coiled and swam; and every track
> Was a flash of golden fire.
>
> O happy living things! no tongue
> Their beauty might declare:
> A spring of love gushed from my heart,
> And I blessed them unaware;
> Sure my kind saint took pity on me,
> And I blessed them unaware.

Coleridge strengthens the concept of the Albatross-mother as a phallic mother by his use of the symbolism of the snake. By its behaviour and by its relation to food and protection the Albatross is the mother, but in one line in the poem it is identified as ' him '. To Coleridge, the father was a feminine, giving male; the mother a masculine, rejecting female. The Mariner at first despised the snakes: the child attempted to fight off the dangerous phallus, to deny his passive impulses; but it was a hopeless struggle.

The Mariner must submit. What was ugly becomes beautiful; what was hated is blessed; what was rejected is accepted. And with the submission the spell begins to break.

> The self-same moment I could pray;
> And from my neck so free
> The Albatross fell off, and sank
> Like lead into the sea.

The submission is a crucial point in the poem. It represents Coleridge's attempt at the time he wrote the poem to resolve his inner conflict and to gain absolution. In the poem the submission is followed by expiation and the reward of magical protection. In life, too, Coleridge took the path of submission and it became the pattern of his defence against the impact of reality. Later he said succinctly:

> Were I Achilles, I would have had my leg cut off, and have got rid of my vulnerable heel (39).

But in life submission did not bring a magical release: it brought only defeat and degradation.

In the poem the acceptance of the creatures of the deep is also an act of restitution. By his acceptance he has restored the object that he had destroyed. The mother and the phallus of the mother, destroyed with the cross-bow, are again made whole.

The first reward which follows the submission is sleep in which he dreams of drinking:

Oh sleep! it is a gentle thing,
Beloved from pole to pole!
To Mary Queen the praise be given!
She sent the gentle sleep from Heaven,
That slid into my soul.

The silly buckets on the deck,
That had so long remained,
I dreamt that they were filled with dew;
And when I awoke, it rained.

My lips were wet, my throat was cold,
My garments all were dank;
Sure I had drunken in my dreams,
And still my body drank.

I moved, and could not feel my limbs:
I was so light—almost
I thought that I had died in sleep,
And was a blessed ghost.

And in a gloss he adds: 'By grace of the holy Mother, the Ancient Mariner is refreshed with rain.' It is the mother whom he thanks for the gift of rain, as it is the mother whom he has killed. The mother whom he has restored to life must forgive him and feed him. What are the 'silly buckets on the deck' which are 'filled with dew?' This is a line that has puzzled literary scholars. 'Silly' in its exact meaning is 'feeble, frail, insignificant' (*Shorter Oxford Dictionary*). It is not too rash an assumption that the buckets symbolize the mother's breasts, previously empty and cruel, now full and forgiving.

The Mariner's sensations on awakening from his life-restoring sleep again refer to feeding:

My lips were wet, my throat was cold.

These are sensations that find a parallel in the clinical observations made by Isakower (40) on the oral sensations of patients while falling asleep and awakening.

Sleep had come to the Mariner as sleep comes to the infant child, with food and satiation. M. J. Eisler (41) in 1921 presented clinical evidence of the relation of sleep to the gratification of oral needs. He described the infant's sleep in terms of a fusion of the child's ego and the breast at nursing. Lewin in his recent studies on sleep phenomena gives brilliant illumination to what he calls 'the oral meaning of sleep' (42). Coleridge offers the evidence of a poet to support the clinical experience of the psycho-analyst.

Sleep was a subject that appeared often in Coleridge's writings. He knew the tortures of troubled sleep, and in his letters and his poems he tells us in detail of his distress. In a letter to Southey in 1803, he wrote:

. . . my spirits are dreadful, owing entirely to the horrors of every night—I truly dread to sleep. It is no shadow with me, but substantial misery foot-thick, that makes me sit by my bedside of a morning and cry (43).

In this letter he included the first draft of a poem, 'The Pains of Sleep'. In this he describes the ideal sleep, expressed in the wish to sleep which is part of Lewin's oral triad:

. . . silently, by slow degrees,
My spirit I to Love compose,
In humble trust mine eye-lids close,
With reverential resignation,
No wish conceived, no thought exprest.
Only a sense of supplication;
A sense o'er all my soul imprest
That I am weak, yet not unblest,
Since in me, round me, every where
Eternal Strength and Wisdom are.

But this enveloping protection which suggests the wish to be reunited with the mother, fails him. His sleep is broken by:

. . . shapes and thoughts that tortured me:
A lurid light, a trampling throng,
Sense of intolerable wrong.

and:

. . . all seemed guilt, remorse or woe,
My own or others still the same
Life-stifling fear, soul-stifling shame.

No wonder, then, that

Sleep, the wide blessing, seemed to me
Distemper's worst calamity.

He could not understand; he does not know the source of his nightmares, the basis of his guilt:

. . . when my own loud scream
Had waked me from the fiendish dream,
O'ercome with sufferings strange and wild,
I wept as I had been a child;
And having thus by tears subdued
My anguish to a milder mood,
Such punishments, I said, were due
To natures deepliest stained with sin,—
For aye entempesting anew
The unfathomable hell within,
The horror of their deeds to view,
To know and loathe, yet wish and do!
Such griefs with such men well agree,
And wherefore, wherefore fall on me?
To be beloved is all I need,
And whom I love, I love indeed.

Coleridge has here described in words that surpass the best efforts of the psycho-analyst, the suffering of the insomniac. The Mariner, after he blessed ' God's creatures of the great calm ', was able to achieve the serene rest, the blissful peace of the satiated infant. It was the sleep which Coleridge wished for, but could not find except with the aid of laudanum. The forgiveness which came to the Mariner was denied to Coleridge. His vengeful super-ego, his masochistic ego brought to the foreground his wish for death, which has already been demonstrated in his reaching out to the Mother, Life-in-Death. The clinical observation that sleep can in the unconscious be equated with death is a familiar one, and is elaborated by Lewin, who points out that the neurotic fear of sleep may be based on a fear of death which wards off a wish to die. The wish to die is the wish to return to the state of ' undisturbed, blank sleep, that is the probable state of mind of the satiated sleeping infant '.

Coleridge presents both aspects of this conflict. Though he often wrote directly of his wish to die, as in the quatrain I quoted above:

> Flash, like a love thought, thro' me, Death!
> And take a life that wearies me,

he also fought against this wish. He wrote in a letter about his addiction:

> I am hard at work, and feel a pleasure and eagerness in it which I have not known for years—a consequence and reward of my courage in at length overcoming the fear of dying suddenly in my Sleep, which Heaven knows! alone seduced me into the fatal habit (44).

In another letter he repeated his distress:

> God forbid that my worst Enemy should ever have the Nights of the Sleep that I have had, night after night—surprised by Sleep, while I struggled to remain awake, starting up to bless my own loud Screams, that had awakened me—yea, dear friend! till my repeated Night-yells had made me a Nuisance in my own House. As I live and am a man, this is an unexaggerated tale—My Dreams become the Substances of my life— (45).

The fear of sleep was the fear of his anxiety-laden dreams. Only opium in ever-increasing doses could give him the peace of dreamless sleep. To a lesser degree also the pains of his illness, which may have served as a bribe to his super-ego, a punishment for his unconscious crimes, also brought him some relief. In the letter just quoted, after a listing of his symptoms, he wrote:

> No Bridegroom ever longed for Rapture more impatiently than I for Torture—It is wonderful, how this has relieved me! how balsam-sweet and profound my Sleep has been—how freely I breathe—how freely my Spirits seem to move within me!

The need for punishment was as much a theme of his life as it was of the *Ancient Mariner*.

The never-ceasing search for rest of the insomniac has a parallel in the eternal wanderings of the Mariner, and as the guilt which peopled Coleridge's dreams with terrifying images kept him from sleep, so did the Mariner's guilt doom him to

> . . . pass, like night, from land to land.[2]

The Mariner has awakened, and at first he is not sure he is alive:

> I moved, and could not feel my limbs:
> I was so light—almost
> I thought that I had died in sleep
> And was a blessed ghost.

So closely are sleep and death identified in the poet's mind, and both are representative of the enveloping peace of the mother's arms, the mother who has fed him.

There follows a scene of glorious vision:

> The upper air burst into life!
> And a hundred fire-flags sheen,
> To and fro they were hurried about!
> And to and fro, and in and out,
> The wan stars danced between.
>
> And the coming wind did roar more loud,
> And the sails did sigh like sedge;
> And the rain poured down from one black cloud;
> The Moon was at its edge.
>
> The thick black cloud was cleft, and still
> The Moon was at its side:
> Like waters shot from some high crag,
> The lightning fell with never a jag,
> A river steep and wide.

In a gloss Coleridge says ' He heareth sounds and seeth strange sights and commotions in the sky and the element '. I must leave unfulfilled the temptation to explore the meaning of this passage, which so strongly suggests a primal

[2] I borrow this parallel from Lewin, who pointed out in his paper ' Sleep, the Mouth and the Dream Screen ' that in the parable of the Wandering Jew there is a representation of insomnia, ' The immortality of the sleepless '.

scene phantasy, because it would be too wide a digression from my central theme.

The poem goes on to its magical phase—the hurried voyage of the ship back to its home port under the influence of the ' blessed troop of angelic spirits, sent down by the invocation of the guardian saint '. Even the Polar Spirit,

> The spirit who bideth by himself
> In the land of mist and snow,
> He loved the bird that loved the man
> Who shot him with his bow.

even this Spirit, most injured by the killing of the Albatross, helps the ship along in ' obedience to the angelic troop '.

Coleridge's optimistic attitude, his child-like sense of an ever-present protector, was evident in his constant hope that some change in his fortunes was about to occur, and appears in the poem as the supernatural forces that carry the Mariner to his home again. The voyage is as the wish-fulfilling dream, as the omnipotent phantasy of the hypomanic patient; it is the full-functioning of the defence by denial:

> Still as a slave before his lord,
> The ocean hath no blast;
> His great bright eye most silently
> Up to the Moon is cast—
> If he may know which way to go;
> For she guides him smooth or grim.
> See, brother, see! how graciously
> She looketh down on him.

It is indeed a dream, for Coleridge notes in a gloss, ' The Mariner hath been cast into a trance; for the angelic power causeth the vessel to drive northward faster than human life could endure '.

When the Mariner comes out of his trance, ' his penance begins anew ', but the voyage continues, more slowly till the ship arrives in the harbour. The ship sinks, but the Mariner is saved, reborn to live out forever the penance for his crime.

I return to the Albatross, and I shall recapitulate the evidence that the Albatross is the symbol of the mother. Coleridge reveals in the various sources I have used, his letters, his poems, and his notes, the converging evidence of his deep conflict about his mother. The interpretations which I have adduced about his infantile hatred, his murderous wishes, his sexual phantasies and the concept of a phallic mother, were all buried in his unconscious mind. He was aware of a profound sense of guilt from his early youth, but as he said in ' The Pains of Sleep ', he did not know why he should suffer so. In the *Ancient Mariner* he indicates the source of his guilt. It is his aggressive, murderous impulses against an object associated with food and protection. His life-story confirms the oral basis of his guilt. There is the preoccupation with food, the never-satisfied searching for love, the attempt to find peace by turning to opium. In his other poems, too, there is the theme of the dangerous precœdipal mother, most clearly demonstrated in *Christabel*. And in the *Ancient Mariner* the image of the mother appears as the Avenger, the Spectre-Woman, Life-in-Death, and as the forgiving ' holy Mother ' who brings rain and sleep. The mother whom he restores to life brings him back to the safety of his homeland. A mother-figure forgives the crime against the mother.

Bunker in a paper ' Mother-Murder in Myth and Legend ' (46), has postulated that the murder of the mother means, to the unconscious, incest with the mother, a concept which may be applied to the *Ancient Mariner*. Bunker indicates that Orestes suffered symbolic castration, the loss of a finger: a genital punishment for his œdipal crime. In contrast the Ancient Mariner suffered hunger, loss of love and loneliness: pregenital punishments for a precœdipal crime.

Coleridge's phantasies did not work in his life experiences. With the years, his depression grew deeper, his hypochondriasis and physical ailments, which his emotional stress exaggerated, more pronounced. He had begun the use of laudanum in his early adulthood, and he became an addict, using as much as a pint a day, a truly enormous dose. He could not tolerate frustration, nor accept pain, though, as we have seen, he preferred the pain to the tortured anxiety of his dreams, and in his later years his addiction made of him a semi-invalid who was never cured.

At this point it is important to settle categorically a fallacy too often repeated about Coleridge. Coleridge's writings are not the outpourings of a diseased mind under the influence of opium. That Coleridge used laudanum freely is an undoubted fact, which he has himself stated on many occasions. But his was a clear, brilliant mind, and his poems were written carefully and with close attention to a conscious skill. Many of his poems passed through several revisions, including the *Ancient*

Mariner. Only one poem, that quintessence of lyricism, *Kubla Khan*, was written as an attempt to recollect a dream while under the influence of laudanum. His addiction was a symptom of his character difficulty, a hopeless effort to find peace. It contributed to the destruction of his creativity as a poet; it does not explain his creativity.

V

I have so far developed the symbolism in *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* and especially the significance of the Albatross, in relation to Coleridge's life, thought, and poetry. I now turn to Wordsworth, who brought to the poem the symbol of the Albatross, the object of the crime.

The suggestion presents itself, as I have already indicated, that Wordsworth's crime was a more specific one and that his contribution to the communal phantasy may have stemmed from a more adult experience, though there can be no question that behind this there would also be infantile determinants. For the purpose of this study, however, the latter are of secondary interest.

Wordsworth was two years older than Coleridge. He suffered the loss of his parents when he was a boy, his mother when he was eight years old, his father when he was fourteen. In 1790, when he was twenty, he went on a trip to France. He walked through France during the period when the Revolution was in its happy state. He loved France; he loved the people of France; and he became an exponent of revolutionary idealism.

Little more than a year later, in the autumn of 1791, Wordsworth returned to France on a second trip. He found a more turbulent France and he found conflict among the people. He also found the love of a woman. He met in Orleans Annette Vallon, who was several years older than he, and a warm and joyous person. The relationship began in his wish to learn the French language from her, but within the year Annette was with child. This story was not revealed to the public until long after Wordsworth's death (47).

Wordsworth's child, a daughter named Caroline, was born in 1792. Wordsworth was not with Annette at the time of the birth because the French Revolution was already in its bloody phase, and Annette and her family had to be in a different city. Circumstances kept the lovers apart, and Wordsworth was forced to leave for England. At first he wanted to marry Annette. He was living at that time with his sister Dorothy, and he told her at once the whole of his plight. Dorothy went to their guardians to plead for the lovers, but permission to marry Annette was refused. Circumstances continued to give Wordsworth excuses for not marrying Annette. It was even impossible for him to go to France during the ensuing years, when France and England were at war. Some years later, when Caroline was about ten years old, Wordsworth and Dorothy saw the child and her mother, but there is little evidence that Wordsworth at that time did more than carry out the amenities of a formal visit. This visit took place just before his marriage to Mary Hutchinson. Annette and Dorothy maintained for many years a close correspondence, but with the years Annette stopped asking William to marry her, assumed the name of Madame William, and with this cloak of respectability lived a full though simple life.

It was not easy for Wordsworth to desert Annette and the child. He wrote later:

> Action is transitory—a step, a blow,
> The motion of a muscle—this way or that—
> 'Tis done: and in the after-vacancy
> We wonder at ourselves like men betrayed:
> Suffering is permanent, obscure and dark,
> And has the nature of infinity.

Whatever the outward appearance, Wordsworth's inner suffering never left him. As we read his poetry written during this period, we find certain themes repeated with impressive frequency. The theme of the forsaken woman is perhaps the most prominent. For two years following his return to England, Wordsworth was occupied with the writing of 'Guilt and Sorrow', a long narrative poem which tells of a woman left alone when her husband is pressed into service to fight in America. In this poem which describes the unhappiness of the forsaken woman, there is also the point that the man has been forced to desert the woman, that he is innocent of wrong-doing. Wordsworth's ability to rationalize developed to a degree that permitted him in the end to live in greater peace with himself than Coleridge was ever able to do. His guilt may have been no less than Coleridge's, but his defences were more effective. That the theme of the forsaken woman was still alive in Wordsworth's mind during the time that the *Ancient Mariner* was conceived is evident in several poems that he

wrote at that time, including 'The Complaint of a Forsaken Indian Woman' 'The Thorn', 'Her Eyes are Wild', and especially the tale of Margaret in *The Excursion*. The theme was with him in full intensity as late as 1805 when he wrote 'Vaudracour and Julia'. He makes in his introduction to this poem the disarming statement that he had heard the story 'from the mouth of a French lady, who had been an eye-and-ear witness of all that was done and said' . . . and further that, 'The facts are true; no invention as to these has been exercised, as none was needed'. It is now generally admitted that this poem is a thinly disguised narrative of his unhappy love of Annette. In the poem the lovers are not permitted to marry because of Vaudracour's cruel father. Again, outside forces prevent the lovers from joining, but in this poem Vaudracour ends his days in a state of melancholy, after the death of his 'motherless babe'.

The theme of a Wanderer who must expiate his guilt is also a common one in Wordsworth's poetry. He wrote in a poetical play, *The Borderers*, which brought from Coleridge excited praise:

> . . . a wanderer *must* I go,
> The Spectre of that Innocent Man, my guide.
> No human ear shall ever hear me speak;
> No human dwelling ever give me food,
> Or sleep or rest: but over waste and wild,
> In search of nothing that this earth can give,
> But expiation, will I wander on—
> A Man by pain and thought compelled to live,
> Yet loathing life—till anger is appeased
> In Heaven, and Mercy gives me leave to die.

This he wrote in 1795, before the *Ancient Mariner* was written, and in 1800 after the *Ancient Mariner* was written, he wrote:

> Day and night my toils redouble,
> Never nearer to the goal;
> Night and day, I feel the trouble
> Of the Wanderer in my soul.

It even seems that the two lines in the *Ancient Mariner* which Coleridge in a footnote attributes to Wordsworth, and which describe the Mariner, could perhaps be applied to Wordsworth himself, who was so in appearance:

> And thou art long, and lank, and brown,
> As is the ribbed sea-sand.

In Wordsworth's guilty mind to reject meant to kill. *The Borderers*, which was written in 1795, describes death which follows desertion. It is a poem filled with a profound guilt:

> I have heard
> Of some dark deed to which in early life
> His passion drove him.

Death was to Wordsworth a disturbing theme, and his charming poem, 'We are Seven,' which was composed in 1798, has as its theme the denial of death. It is perhaps significant that the famous note which Wordsworth dictated so many years later about the *Ancient Mariner*, and which I quoted at the beginning of this paper, was in response to a question about the poem, 'We are Seven'. It is as though thoughts of death and their denial remained in Wordsworth's mind in association with the crime of murder in the *Ancient Mariner*.

In Wordsworth's unconscious mind he was a murderer who had killed Annette. The Albatross, whose killing came to his mind so quickly when Coleridge presented him with the theme of the *Ancient Mariner*, is an indication of how close to the surface was his sense of guilt. The Albatross became to him the symbol of the 'dead' beloved.

Both Coleridge and Wordsworth had to deal with the problem of a lost love-object. Coleridge's defences were those of an oral character: he incorporated the object and he developed depression. He sought forgiveness from the outer world—he reached for love as a sign of this forgiveness. His defences failed, and in his inability to accept his punishment he fled to addiction to avoid pain. Wordsworth's defence was to retreat from his emotional conflicts to conservatism and forgetfulness, to isolation and repression. He abandoned his revolutionary ideas even as he abandoned Annette, and brought upon him Browning's bitter denunciation in the poem, 'The Lost Leader'. He succeeded in forgetting so fully the impact of his conflict about Annette that in his later years he said to his wife (who knew about his relationship with Annette and the existence of his daughter), during a discussion about France in the revolution, 'I wonder how I came to stay there so long, and at a period so exciting' (48). Wordsworth sacrificed his idealism but retained his emotional stability. This was in the nature of his personality. Wordsworth could meet adversity. He found a semblance of peace.

> Sustained by memory of the past
> And strength of Reason; held above
> The infirmities of mortal love;
> Undaunted, lofty, calm, and stable,
> And awfully impenetrable.

In this connection the Lucy poems assume a special significance. They are poems of mourning, but there has never been any evidence of a real Lucy Gray. He wrote:

> She lived unknown, and few could know
> When Lucy ceased to be;
> But she is in her grave, and, oh,
> The difference to me!

Wordsworth's sudden abandonment of Annette did not permit him to work through the grief that followed the loss of his beloved. He could not give direct expression to the sorrow within him. There followed the years of guilt and the need for punishment:

> A wanderer *must* I go.

These years saw the creation of 'Guilt and Sorrow' and other poems in the same vein, as well as the image of the Albatross for Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*. In the Lucy Gray poems Wordsworth restored the lost love-object, only to have her die again. He was able to mourn her in some of the tenderest lines in English poetry, to work through his grief, to resolve his inner conflict and to avoid the depression which destroyed Coleridge.

Coleridge too sought to expiate his guilt. In a very early edition of his poems which appeared when he was twenty-four years old, he wrote:

> The communicativeness of our nature leads us to describe our own sorrows; in the endeavour to describe them intellectual activity is exerted; and by a benevolent law of our nature from intellectual activity a pleasure results which is gradually associated and mingles as a corrective with the painful subjects of the description (49).

But with the years it became more and more difficult for him to find release from his sorrows in his writings.

Coleridge's depression reached great depths, and in 1802 in his tragic poem, 'Dejection, An Ode', he describes his feelings:

> A grief without a pang, void, dark, and drear,
> A stifled, drowsy, unimpassioned grief,
> Which finds no natural outlet, no relief,
> In word, or sigh, or tear—

It cannot be without significance that this poem was written on the occasion of Wordsworth's marriage to Mary Hutchinson, an added hint of Coleridge's unconscious homosexual attachment to his friend.

It is of some interest to trace the subsequent attitudes of Wordsworth to the *Ancient Mariner*. The poem was first published in a collection entitled *Lyrical Ballads*, which was made up mostly of poems written by Wordsworth. The book was not well received by the critics of the time, and the *Ancient Mariner* received more than its share of unfavourable comment, and soon Wordsworth too joined the ranks of the critics. When the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads* was published several years later, Wordsworth included the poem, but appended an apologetic note to it, in which he said:

> The Poem of my Friend has indeed great defects; first, that the principal person has no distinct character, either in his profession of Mariner, or as a human being who having been long under the control of supernatural impressions might have supposed himself to partake of something supernatural: secondly that he does not act, but is continually acted upon: thirdly, that the events having no necessary connection do not produce each other; and lastly, that the imagery is somewhat too laboriously accumulated (50).

Wordsworth has brought upon himself severe calumny from literary critics for this defection.

But Wordsworth's own poetry belies the lack of sensitivity of which he has been accused, as I hope I have demonstrated. Is it not perhaps the case that Wordsworth revealed himself far beyond his intent when he suggested to Coleridge the killing of the Albatross and that, as the dreamer tries to forget his dream, so did Wordsworth attempt to repudiate his revelation? This would be an unconscious repudiation which he rationalized by his criticism of the construction of the poem. It becomes a defence against the awareness of his unconscious impulses. In fact, some of his criticisms can be understood as projections of his own inner conflicts. He criticizes Coleridge for failing to delineate the Mariner in his profession or as a human being. Yet he, more than Coleridge, has in his poetry utilized the theme of the Wanderer seeking expiation from guilt, with no clearer delineation. Also in his note he comments that the Mariner does not act, but is continually acted upon. And, it is this precisely which characterizes the guilty man in his poems: always it is a man who has forsaken a woman innocently as a result of outside forces.

Coleridge did not succeed in his struggle against his ill-health, his despondency, and his addiction. The last three or four years of his

life were for the most part spent in a sick room. His writings in his last years were metaphysical speculations on religion and literature in which there appeared a search for a unity with an all-powerful, all-good Being. He wrote:

> On entering a cathedral . . . I am lost to the actualities that surround me, and my whole being expands into the infinite; earth and air, nature and art, all swell up into eternity, and the only sensible impression left is, ' that I am nothing! ' (51).

In an early poem, ' Religious Musings ', he wrote of

> God only to behold, and know, and feel,
> Till by exclusive consciousness of God
> All self-annihilated it shall make
> God its Identity: God all in all!
> We and our Father one!

In these passages Coleridge expresses the third part of Lewin's oral triad, the unconscious wish to be devoured, to become as nothing in the union with an all-embracing, all-loving parent.

And in the *Ancient Mariner* also, Coleridge foreshadows the religion of love in which he sought peace:

> While each to his great Father bends,
> Old men, and babes, and loving friends
> And youths and maidens gay!
>
> Farewell, farewell! but this I tell
> To thee, thou Wedding-Guest!
> He prayeth well, who loveth well
> Both man and bird and beast.
>
> He prayeth best, who loveth best
> All things both great and small;
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all.

The last poems he wrote were still a search for forgiveness. And his final poem was an epitaph for himself:

> Stop, Christian passer-by!—Stop, child of God,
> And read with gentle breast. Beneath this sod
> A poet lies, or that which once seem'd he.
> O, lift one thought in prayer for S.T.C.;
> That he who many a year with toil of breath
> Found death in life, may here find life in death!
> Mercy for praise—to be forgiven for fame
> He ask'd, and hoped, through Christ. Do thou
> the same!

So it seems that ' The Nightmare Life-in-Death ' whom he met in 1797, appeared to him again as he lay on his death-bed. Only in death did he achieve the reunion with the mother for whom he searched all his life; in death he found the blissful state of infantile omnipotence,

> That always finds, and never seeks.

The Rime of the Ancient Mariner, which originated as an attempt by Coleridge to resolve his conflict, failed him, but it became for all men since, who share with him the emotions of which he wrote, a resting-place in the lonesome oceans that all must travel. What Coleridge said of Dante's *Inferno* may be applied to his poem:

> It affords a good instance . . . of that soul of *universal* significance in a true poet's composition (52).

* * *

I wish to express to Margaret Owen, formerly of Vassar College, my gratitude for her suggestions and advice in the preparation of this paper. She has encouraged me in my belief that there is a common interest which the literary scholar and the psychoanalyst may share and to which each may contribute his special knowledge.

I also wish to thank my colleagues, Drs. Jacob Arlow, Charles Brenner and Martin Wangh, who have read this paper as a ' work in progress ', and whose comments have been helpful to a degree that can be neither accurately measured nor adequately acknowledged.

(Received July 15, 1950)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS TO WHICH FREQUENT REFERENCE IS MADE ARE ABREVIATED AS FOLLOWS:

L. = *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Edited by Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Boston and New York, 1895.

U.L. = *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Edited by Earl Leslie Griggs. London, 1932.

A.P. = Coleridge, S. T. *Anima Poetae.* London, 1895.

G. = *The Prose Works of William Wordsworth.* Edited by A. B. Grosart. London, 1876.

P.W. = *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Edited by Ernest Hartley Coleridge. Oxford, 1912.

(1) Coleridge, S. T. *Biographia Literaria.* New York, 1856, p. 373.

(2) Lowes, J. L. *The Road to Xanadu.* London, 1927, p. 596.

(3) *A.P.*, p. 5.

(4) Fausset, H. I'A. *Poets and Pundits.* New Haven, 1947, p. 152.

(5) *A.P.*, p. 96.
(6) Lowes, *ibid.*, p. 301.
(7) *P.W.*, **1**, p. 186. (All quotations of Coleridge's poetry are from this edition.)
(8) *G.*, **3**, p. 16. (The date in this reference is given as ' the spring of the year 1798. Later studies have set the correct date as the autumn of 1797. See Lowes, *ibid.*, p. 529.)
(9) *G.*, **3**, p. 442.
(10) *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth.* Edited by William Knight. Edinburgh, 1882. (All quotations of Wordsworth's poetry are from this edition.)
(11) *L.*, **1**, p. 11.
(12) *L.*, **1**, p. 7.
(13) *L.*, **1**, p. 14.
(14) *L.*, **1**, p. 21.
(15) *L.*, **1**, p. 59.
(16) *L.*, **1**, p. 305.
(17) *U.L.*, **2**, p. 25.
(18) *L.*, **1**, p. 364.
(19) Campbell, J. D. *Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* London, 1894, p. 3.
(20) Gillman, J. *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* London, 1838, p. 6.
(21) *U.L.*, **2**, p. 390.
(22) *L.*, **1**, p. 19.
(23) *L.*, **1**, p. 20.
(24) Gillman, *ibid.*, p. 20.
(25) *A.P.*, p. 167.
(26) Gillman, *ibid.*, p. 20.
(27) *L.*, **1**, p. 158.
(28) *L.*, **1**, p. 78.
(29) *L.*, **1**, p. 24.
(30) Gillman, *ibid.*, p. 28.
(31) Hanson, L. *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* London, 1938, pp. 90, 101.
(32) *L.*, **1**, p. 126.
(33) *L.*, **1**, p. 224.
(34) *Biographia Epistolaris.* Edited by A. Turnball. 1911, **1**, p. 133.
(35) Lewin, B. D. *The Psychoanalysis of Elation.* New York, 1950, p. 103.
(36) *P.W.*, **1**, p. 140.
(37) Coleridge, S. T. *Biographia Literaria.* New York, 1856, p. 586.
(38) *A.P.*, p. 12.
(39) *A.P.*, p. 25.
(40) Isakower, O. ' A Contribution to the Pathopsychology of Phenomena Associated with Falling Asleep ', *Int. J. Psychoanal.*, **19**, 1938.
(41) Eisler, M. J. ' Pleasure in Sleep and Disturbed Capacity for Sleep ', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **3**, 1922 (in German, 1921).
(42) Lewin, B. D. ' Sleep, the Mouth and the Dream Screen ', *Psychoanal Quart.*, **15**, 1946.
—— ' Inferences from the Dream Screen ', *Int. J. Pscho-Anal.*, **29**, 1948.
(43) *L.*, **1**, p. 435.
(44) *U.L.*, **2**, p. 4.
(45) *U.L.*, **1**, p. 286.
(46) Bunker, H. A. ' Mother-Murder in Myth and Legend ', *Psa. Quart.*, **13**, 1944.
(47) Legouis, E. *William Wordsworth and Annette Vallon.* London, 1922.
(48) *G.*, **3**, p. 479.
(49) *P.W.*, **2**, p. 1136.
(50) See Lowes, *ibid.*, p. 520.
(51) Coleridge, S. T. *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare with other Literary Remains.* New York, 1854, p. 235.
(52) *A.P.*, p. 293.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF MURDER[1]

By WALTER BROMBERG, M.D., Reno, Nevada

Responsible members of society have been increasingly concerned with the steady stream of murders that are committed in the United States. Recently, officials[2] of our heavily populated states have inquired whether psychiatrists through their specialized knowledge can aid in foretelling the possibility of violent aggression in a given individual. The question posed may be stated in these psychological terms: Are there demonstrable evidences of unconscious influences on ego function which may serve as a warning of impending acting-out of violent aggression?

Psycho-analytic psychiatry has within its subject matter and orientation possibilities of providing this insight. Yet society has neither stimulated nor made possible any large-scale study of murderers of sufficient intensity to shed light on the unconscious basis for the crime of murder. Society through its legal agencies utilizes the basic viewpoint that man's behaviour is to be judged solely on its observable phenomenology. Data concerning unconscious derivatives, ego defences and superego weaknesses are not considered valid material for judicial judgement or acceptable scientific evidence in the legal forum.

Still, legalistic procedure is beginning to be influenced by a perception of the practical importance of understanding motivation in criminal acts. For example, when in an assault case the forces motivating the criminal are seen to result from aggressive defences against overwhelming unconscious passive impulses, society's agents are equipped to treat the individual more intelligently and to estimate his future adjustment more accurately. Conversely, punishment for crime without modification of the offender's personality is a sterile, costly and uncertain method of treating malefactors. Such considerations should impel society to reassess its governing formulas and practices in criminology in the light of their pragmatic value. Pending society's eventual acceptance of the rôle of unconscious influences on ego-functioning in crime, psycho-analysts have the technical means to go on investigating the dynamics of major crimes.

A handful of studies of psychological concomitants of murder, particularly in schizophrenic or schizoid individuals, have been worked out (18, 12, 6). These show that the victim often represents the murderer in the latter's unconscious. The psychopathic or psychotic individual projects his castration fears and guilt-directed punishment tendencies to someone in his environment who has, in the offender's mind, come symbolically to represent himself. There is sufficient material extant concerning murderers to support Freud's (9) finding, made among melancholics, that destructive impulses towards others can be turned against oneself through introjection of a love object with which the subject is identified. Cases of murder and suicide have been found to have been effected through this mechanism (16, 13, 10, 7).

Another approach to the analysis of unconscious motives in murder is through a study of attitudes towards death. Investigation of the psychological basis for attitudes towards death on the part of murderers (14) and among normals (3) demonstrates the ubiquity of representations of the love object in unconscious mentation. There are varied unconscious meanings of death for self or others (murder); death can be an equivalent for final sexual union with an incest object; a state of final narcissistic perfection of the body image granting eternal satisfaction; gratification of masochistic tendencies towards self and others, and so on. Similarly, Zilboorg (19) has found the act of suicide to represent unconscious libidinal strivings. Analytic interpretation of suicide and

---

[1] Presented at the Annual Meeting, San Francisco and Los Angeles Psycho-analytical Societies, Santa Barbara, California, October 29 and 30, 1949.

[2] Personal communication from Governor Earl Warren of California, to the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, July, 1949.

murder leads to the ' paradoxical formulation ' that in terms of the unconscious system ' murder is suicide and suicide is murder ' (15).

In alcoholic individuals these mechanisms are graphically represented in the symptomatology because alcohol seemingly has a specific effect on two functions of the ego—the superego and body image perception. Under the pressure of a severe superego, patients suffering from alcoholic hallucinosis and delirium not infrequently become involved in suicidal attempts. Guilt arising from disturbances of the psychosexual organization (homosexuality and perversions) in alcoholism is defended against by projection to external persons who may then be aggressively attacked. The external person may represent also an introject with which the patient is identified. Whether suicide or murder occurs depends upon the libidinal attachment which the patient maintains towards early introjected figures.

Body image perceptions altered by the toxic effects of alcohol also evoke anxieties visible in the frequent castration and dismemberment fears of acute alcoholic psychotics. The projections which provide the characteristic colouring of alcoholic delusions and hallucinations are in defence of unconscious castration fears. These reactions dip into the infantile psychic organization of the patient (anal levels) but also reflect current anxieties stimulated by body image changes due directly to toxic effects of alcohol. Early studies (17, 11) indicated the phallic and anal significance of alcoholic hallucinations. Later, Bromberg and Schilder (5) stressed the dismemberment elements as representing regression of castration fears to a more primitive fear of injury to the whole body. Guilt from unconscious passive impulses aids regression to an earlier level where dismemberment represents destruction of the body image. The psychopathology and physiopathology of alcoholic psychosis (castration and dismemberment fears, perverse tendencies and homosexual elements, disorders of equilibrium and time sense), indicate the intermixture of body image perception disorder and psychosexual disturbances that assail the ego. When the defences against this catastrophic series of injuries to the alcoholic's ego fail, aggressive acts like murder and suicide occur.

The case reported here is a clinical demonstration of murder in a severe alcoholic in which the act of assault represents symbolic suicide. The victim of the murder was the offender's wife, who represented the feared female figure with which the offender was unconsciously identified. The mother-figure was the castrator; therefore both suicide and murder represented solutions to the prisoner's unconscious conflict. Suicidal impulses through murder represented a defence against gratification of unconscious feminine impulses in the prisoner, while the actuality of murder was expressed in revenge against the introjected wife-mother figure.

The prisoner, X, a man of thirty-five, a former policeman, had been divorced by his wife several months before the crime. He went to his ex-wife's home one evening to await her arrival from work. He asked to talk with her, but she refused, whereupon X shot her three times at close range. As she fell, X with gun in hand said ' coldly ', according to the only witness, a taxi driver who had brought the victim home, ' Roll her over and see if she is dead.' X then left the scene unhurriedly and was apprehended a few minutes later drinking in a bar. When asked by officers for the whereabouts of his gun, X searched for it with the officers, finally locating it in a nearby shrub.

On the day of the murder, as for weeks prior to the shooting, X had been drinking excessively to the point of stupefaction. He had impulsively determined to leave the country for overseas construction work and had taken up his revolver on the day of the killing to sell before his departure. Less than an hour before the crime, X had gone to his mother-in-law's home to bid her good-bye, saying several times to her, ' Mother, I hate to do this to you, because I love you so much.' The jury in the trial court convicted X of first degree (premeditated) murder, chiefly on the basis of his actions following the remarks quoted. The appeal court refused to lower the degree of the crime on the presumption that the ' defendant's use of intoxicants before the shooting was to create in him sufficient courage to commit the crime which had been in his mind for more than three months before its occurrence '.

The offender was first seen shortly after the crime occurred. X, a tall, well-developed man, had been a heavy user of alcohol since his eighteenth year. He was fourth of a family of ten children, three of whom died in infancy. The siblings immediately younger than X were a sister two years his junior, a brother Y, and a sister Z, six years younger than the prisoner. X remembered that during a 'flu epidemic

when he was six, another younger sister, B, was very sick; he recalled she asked for water and ' then died '. At that time he had a lamb which became bloated and also died. Fear of the dark became prominent soon after the death of the sister B, and it was then that the prisoner frequently told his mother, ' I am going to die '. The prisoner had become quite attached to his sister Z during his adolescence and young-manhood. The prisoner differed from his siblings in being tense, neurotic and hyperactive in early years. The attending physician at X's birth informed the mother that he would be a ' nervous ' child. At the age of about six he used to steal milk from two of the younger children and hide under the crib to drink it. Later, his mother made a bottle for him from which he drank in hiding.

At school he was nervous and frightened; he attended under protest, having to be dragged and sometimes whipped. His tension in the schoolroom was extreme. Teachers finally sent him home as being unsuitable for study. In high school his restlessness continued and he was finally exempted from attending school. The community's opinion about him was uniform. He was disliked and said to be impulsive and reckless. At one time X was struck over the head with a wagon tree by an irate villager who caught him in a corral stealing a ride on a horse. His boyhood behaviour ' set him apart '. Fighting on the part of X was characterized by wildness and meaninglessness, according to adults who gave the history in retrospect. There were two brothers and one sister older than X with whom he had little to do. He was in constant contact with the sisters and brother younger than himself. His play was remarked as being unnecessarily rough and aggressive.

X stated that his first sexual relations were at the age of six. He just lay on a girl and ' got nowhere '. He remembered at the age of ten that he and another boy were discovered by the teacher behind the barn ' laying on two girls '. From the age of twelve he had intercourse with a girl about once a month with normal ejaculations. At the age of ten he remembered trying to mount a calf. When he was fifteen he was going with three girls with whom he had intercourse regularly. At sixteen relations started with prostitutes. Soon after, X met a woman of forty, mother of three children, whose husband was confined in prison. He had normal relations with her as often as three times a week for a year or two. Promiscuity continued actively until X married at the age of nineteen. His wife was not passionate, and later on, he stated, she simply accepted relations as a marriage duty. There was no infidelity until many years later, and it usually occurred during intoxication.

The first baby born to X and his wife, a boy, died three days after birth of hæmophilia. The wife was not affected by the death of the infant, but the prisoner was very upset. He himself brought the child's body home for burial in his home town. The second and living child, also a boy, was born two years later.

At the age of sixteen X started drinking and never ceased. For the next thirteen years X made a good economic adjustment at a semi-skilled job, but drank persistently. For five years prior to the offence he was a police officer and sheriff.

The prisoner's symptomatology started two years before the offence. He was observed to be duller and showed the beginnings of alcoholic mental deterioration. At that time X was working as a police officer, complaining of frequent lapses of memory about which he developed considerable anxiety. He would be concerned the next morning as to whether he had correctly received radio messages at the sergeant's desk the previous night. ' I had the feeling that I might pick up the papers that morning and see that I had committed a crime the night before.' He worried lest he had got into a fight, or done something unbecoming a police officer. He was always startled to find that in the main he handled his records correctly.

About this period X underwent an operation for hæmorrhoids. Following this he was suddenly struck by the idea that he might lose the power to impregnate his wife. From that time on he had a feeling that something was wrong inside, that he was different. His wife, to reassure him, suggested that she might try artificial insemination. This thought shocked him. X was anxious for more children, but his wife was indifferent. The wife remarked to a sister at this time that X was more like a brother to her than a husband. The feeling pervaded his thinking that everything ' I did was wrong '. ' I thought of killing myself many times about then.' X continued to drink heavily through this period.

One and a half years before the offence, X's wife divorced him, ostensibly because of alcoholism. To him this action appeared inexplicable; he was unaware of any obvious

tension between himself and his wife. Nevertheless, X accepted the divorce and immediately went to live with his mother-in-law. Within two weeks X and his wife were remarried. A year later the wife again divorced him for the reason that ' she couldn't stand his continued drinking '. This was the point at which X was brought to a physician, who pointed out that alcoholic poisoning of the brain was occurring—he was, according to his wife, ' losing his mind '.

X was extremely toxic and confused. He lost his job as police officer. During the following three months he lived with his brother, a sheriff; part of the time passing in and out of delirium. He was observed to be confused, forgetful and repetitive in his speech and at times hallucinating. Every indication was present to allow a retrospective diagnosis of alcoholic encephalopathy. During this period he was constantly watched by his relatives, and on one occasion is alleged to have said to relatives, ' I'll have to kill my wife and myself.' Eight days before the murder he was apprehended in a hotel room by his sister Z with a gun aimed at his temple. The day before the crime X had gone to his ex-wife's home and told a friend there, ' I'm going to the edge of town and blow my brains out.'

X's drinking increased in tempo. Consumption of one to two quarts of gin or whisky each day during this period was not unusual for him. About three months before the offence he started the daily use of phenobarbital and codeine in addition to alcohol, to reduce his tension.

A detailed study of the prisoner's recollections during the days before the murder and at the time of the offence itself demonstrated amnesia with an occasional island of memory for the period of about a month. The clinical picture was rather an organic memory defect than a loss of personal identity. This amnestic period merged with the delirium itself which became unmistakable upon X's incarceration after the murder. The account of a fellow prisoner indicated the nature of X's toxic state observed within twenty-four hours after he was apprehended:

> He looked everybody over in a wild sort of way. He yelled, ' I know too much, they are going to get me.' He snatched things out of the air. He got a razor, turned his face to the corner and was going to cut his throat. I twisted his arm down and pulled the blade out. After the first night, I saw him urinate in a cup, drink it and toss the urine over his head like a shower.

The delirium persisted for about seven days after apprehension, finally clearing up. For weeks thereafter, clinical evidences of alcoholic encephalopathy were demonstrable.

The amnesia and delirium displayed by the prisoner were of organic origin. Nevertheless, they demonstrated psychological movements within the ego which are discernible in the delirium much as the manifest dream content or creative productions of the schizophrenic directly state his inner conflicts. Dismemberment and castration motives are plainly visible in the prisoner's productions given soon after the crime was committed. As the alcoholic toxicity receded, the memory of the delirious period became interlarded with confabulations which clearly betrayed the strong instinctual drives and defences thereto that formed the psychological core of X's psychosis. The prisoner remembered the offence and the period preceding it, as follows:

> My mother said to sell my gun to get money to go to the coast. The last thing I remember I was at a bar drinking whisky. I recall being in a cab . . . and then sitting in the bar with detectives around questioning me . . . I couldn't see and suddenly all the faces materialized . . . the next thing I knew I was in the Chief's office and then I was on top of a cliff and they were shoving babies over the cliff. Then I was on top of the hotel and they were doing the same thing. They were cutting babies up. They had no clothes on. I recognized some of the babies. They were my sister's. My boy was one thrown over the cliff. My mother, father and sister were there. Everybody I knew was thrown over the cliff. Yesterday, I could see my sister's babies when I looked at the wall. Last night there were cages moving up and down.

Repeated recitals of the delirium introduced confabulations that showed the heightened anxiety of castration fears. At the same time X's defences against these unconscious fears appear as projections of sadistic attacks of gangsters (father) upon babies (his sons) and of fellatio impulses upon himself. A few days later he said:

> I kept covering my face with my hands and looking out from under them, watching a cage moving up and down. There was some woman there but she never talked to me. She was the operator of the cage. She said to someone else, ' That man knows this is a cage and there is crooked gambling going on over there.'

Then I was on top of a cliff, a high cliff. They had wheelbarrows moving babies off the cliff; somebody was pushing wheelbarrows to cut babies up in. Heads, legs, and everything. I was counting them. Somebody took my sister's children and killed them. I could see it through the mesh in the cage. They tied them up with wire and burned up their feet. I could see children jumping up and down screaming. They would put different pieces of different bodies in wheelbarrows and dump them off the cliff. Some bodies were still left in a sack. Some way my brother got word of this and got some Rangers with blue or green coats and they were going to kill the people on top of the hotel. At the hotel there was a big Texan with a big knife. They were cutting men's penises off and shoving them in their mouths. They cut the testicles off too and put a piece of plaster over it. I was still locked in the cage and I wanted to get out. I still thought it was an elevator cage. I waited for my brother to get me out.

The delirium remained as an isolated experience in the prisoner's mind. The material varied as he repeated the delirium, usually in the direction of increasing the castration details. The prisoner maintained his amnesia up to the present time—more than two years after the offence. Confabulations constantly brought forward in repeated recitals of his delirium betrayed the extreme fear of body destruction through dismemberment. The thinly veiled sadistic impulses are clearly visible in the projections, at the same time that masochistic gratification from oral penetration fantasies is achieved. Two months after the initial delirium, X said:

I was on a high cliff. On the cliff there were two hundred and fifty babies to be cut up and dumped over the cliff. They had wheelbarrows to carry them in. I was supposed to count the babies. I saw that some of the babies were my sister's and other relations. The babies had no eyes. They had been taken out and fed to the cats. I thought I would get glass eyes and put them in. I also thought some one would be needed to put the babies back together again and I would do it. To do that I would have to find the pieces. So I went to the bottom of the hill where the pieces were dumped. A gang was hanging babies up by putting wire around their necks. Those they couldn't hang up that way, they put spikes through their mouths and out through the back of their heads.

They knocked their teeth out. My sister's children were there. They were strung up with wire. They called, 'Look, Uncle'. They were jumping around and screaming. A man was burning their feet. All the children were getting their feet burned. They pulled off the feet after they were burned. I tried to get to them. The gang was putting babies in an ice box.

My brother heard about what was going on and called the Rangers. The Rangers in blue and green coats surrounded the hotel and captured the gang. They put them all in a big ice box. Someone told me that everything was going to be all right. But the gang escaped from the ice box and started doing the same things again. The Rangers captured them again and killed them this time. All the time I could see the faces of the babies still hanging up. A Ranger told me every floor in the hotel was full of bodies.

A man from Texas was cutting the penises off some men. He made them put them in their mouths. The men couldn't swallow them and they became sick. The Texan put tape over the cut.

With these expressions of sadistic torture are coincident efforts at restitution. He murders and tortures, but his victims 'escape' or are 'put together'. The alternation of destruction of the children through dismemberment with attempts to undo the results of X's projected aggression runs through the prisoner's productions. But he cannot avoid the fearful eventuality that he will suffer the fate of the babies. The pressure of superego is too great. The prisoner is castrated by the man from Texas (the father?) and is further punished by being forced into a passive rôle in fellatio.

Unconscious wishes to accept the penis orally appeared quite undisguised. It will be recalled how the prisoner showered himself with his own urine and drank it early in his delirium. In the delirium content, elements of passivity were also persistently repeated. In one series of delirious confabulations (fifteen months after the offence), X is lying in a supine position looking up at men and women above him:

I am in a jail which has coloured pictures all over the top of the ceiling; I was lying down looking up. They were women, birds and men. Their idea was to put indelible ink in my eyes to blind me and tear the skin off my ears and put indelible ink there.

As islands of memory became larger and the repressive forces inherent in the amnesia lifted (twenty-two months after the offence), the defensive purposes of the castration and dismemberment activities became more obvious. Under the influence of strong guilt feelings the

prisoner had regressed to a level of body image organization and perception in which castration was represented by destruction through dismemberment. But another meaning of castration becomes clear in X's productions. His babies will be decimated, his siblings destroyed, his police associates emasculated, but he also will lose his maleness; X is going to be made into a woman and 'bleed into a bucket'. There is no escape from this fate—none except suicide or murder. The following is another sample of remembered delirium:

While I was seeing babies cut up and so forth, I also saw a man put in a coffin and put in the cement. Right after that I was taken to a jail and they made sores all over my face and put ink in my eyes so I was blind. Some of the men they cut, they, I mean by the gang that was doing all this—made them stand over a bucket and bleed in it before putting tape on them. They were going to throw blood on me after throwing me in front of a train.

Body image changes in the direction of transformation to a woman stimulated drastic defences. The severe anxiety aroused by the unconscious perception of body image changes was defended against by both the amnesia and the acted-out aggression. X's ego ideal would not tolerate this regressive transformation into a passive individual. The introjected women (wife or mother) within the prisoner must be punished for his loss of masculinity.

Dream material in this prisoner utilized the same graphic symbolism as is seen in the delirium. As in psychotic patients, the lack of associations available to help unravel the latent content of dreams was compensated for by the paucity of distortion of the manifest dream figures. Dreams in the later period began to demonstrate the mechanism of displacement of aggression against the self to women. The following dream (fifteen months after the offence), states this situation. It is to be noted that X fired three shots into his wife's body from behind, two of them on the left side of her back.

I was in a car in town and I knew my wife was dead, and I was trying to find out how it happened. All of a sudden I knew my wife had been in a car and hit by a train and killed. This part of the dream is strange as it seemed to be more of knowing or feeling these things and not seeing them. Next, I was in a house talking to my sister Z. I didn't have on any clothes, but I had three large metal screws in my body. One in my right side, one on my left side and one in my left arm. I told Z that these screws were to adjust my body. I took a screwdriver and turned the screw in my right side. It turned the flesh and hurt.

In these dreams the reality situation of the shooting makes its appearance in the manifest dream content as a condensation of early oral deprivation (nudity), his boyhood eccentricities (a screw loose), and identifications with his sister Z (the sexual connotation of 'screw'), and possibly his own castration wishes.

His sister Z had been deserted by her husband and left with two children. Since then she had been closer to X than ever before. Z was the one who interrupted his suicidal attempt three days before the crime and who was anxiously watching him during his stupefied period of several weeks prior to the offence. The prisoner was identified with Z who had also been hurt by a man (screwed) by her husband's desertion. On several occasions X had gone with Z's husband on alcoholic sprees. One time on a prolonged drinking spree, X stated he had got drunk and then found himself in Texas with his brother-in-law. To be like sister Z was to be deprived. Identification with her gratified unconscious passive wishes, but the severe anxiety occasioned by the perception of body image changes to that of a woman's was also observable. For example this dream:

I had three scars on my body, one on my left wrist and one on my side. The other one I don't know where it was now. These were white bullet scars. It seems to me that these scars had a metal screw that I could turn and some way make my body different. I turned the one in my side and it hurt very much. I think I was showing my sister Z this.

In the prisoner's dreams and deliria, the death of his wife was re-enacted in its psychologic essence and unconscious meaning. At first, the murder is directly understandable as an unconscious act of vengeance against women. Later, the murder is also seen to contain a death wish turned on to himself and the introjected mother figure (wife) with whom identification has occurred. One of X's early (delirious) statements was that he remembered seeing a girl shoot his sister in the back with a rifle. He saw her fall on the courthouse steps. 'They had to dig the bullet out of her back with a pocket knife.' He recalled that three days before the crime he had been out with a girl. All he remembered was her 'big, black eyes' in the morning and a cowboy coming into the

hotel room to tell him how lucky he was not to have been out that night because three policemen had been shot. Actually, two had been killed in an armed robbery. Several times subsequently, X remembered the fantasied shooting of his sister. Once he added the detail that a police officer had dug the bullets out of her back—' Yet she is still here,' he added.

There were many dreams in which the prisoner's wife was in danger or injured. In these X's aggression is displaced from women to children (his son), and finally to himself. In the following dream he states that his dead baby was killed by a mother. While the fundamental unconscious wish is stated in the dream, revenge against mother for depriving him as an infant, the ever-active superego exerts its force in the uniform of the policeman (cf. the Rangers, in the delirium, who punish the gangsters). The dead baby, like all the babies in his unconscious, represent his own castrated state, i.e. his helplessness. In the dream X was trying to drive some horses:

I was holding them by the neck and they were dragging me—my wife was standing near and almost got run over. Next, I was up on a hill and my boy and sister-in-law's little girl came to me and told me my mother-in-law wanted me. My boy was dressed in a uniform. It was a green one with a white Sam Browne belt. Just like the ones I saw when the green and blue coats came to save the hotel. I went to see what my mother-in-law wanted; she showed me a baby and said it was hers. The baby was dead and I felt very badly.

It seems clear that the destruction of the wife-victim was a symbolic destruction of a frightened man whose alcoholism unmasked his regression to a state of infantile helplessness. The theme of oral deprivation of insecurity and emptiness was seen frequently in his dreams. Often X dreamt of an empty house. The empty house is mother from whom he could not get enough love. It will be remembered that X stole milk bottle preparations from his young sister and brother. The childhood insecurity was related to his vast oral needs which he reacted to by wild impulsive behaviour as a boy and active sexual life in adolescence. About seventeen months after the crime he reported this dream:

We went into a house, the people were eating, and my boy was getting ready to sit down to table . . . I wouldn't let him. Next, I was in a long building with rooms on each side of a hallway . . . then the building turned into a house with hundreds of rooms.

Frequently, X had dreams of being naked or of seeing girls naked in relation to manifest content dealing with vacant houses:

I was in a large vacant house with my sisters . . . the house was old . . . the plumbing fixtures were torn up in the bathroom . . . I saw a girl and found she didn't have any underclothes on.

The theme of nakedness and emptiness seemed to have an added significance in this material in the direction of castration elaboration. It meant to be transformed into a woman. From this point of view the prisoner's depression two years before the crime when he felt he was ' different ' and had become sterile, can be understood as the effect of warded-off unconscious passive longings assailing the ego. The aggressive defence employed by X against the fear of impending transformation into a woman was acted out directly in the murder as well as earlier in flights from home and alcoholic sprees. The following dream (nineteen months after the offence), states the psychic situation almost diagrammatically:

Two men grabbed me from behind, one around the waist, one low down around the knees, then another put his hand under my sweater and pulled out two ticket stubs, he laughed. I became angry and threw myself over backwards and started to fight. I got hold of one man's arm, bent it back and broke it off, dropped it on the ground. Blood was running from the stub end. This man was lying on the ground, he seemed to be all broken up, one leg was torn off, stomach open and blood was flowing all over. I stood and watched him crawl and wriggle along the ground, then I bent down, picked up his arm and threw it over beside him.

During the first year after conviction while incarcerated on 'death row', X was depressed and suffered periods of sharp anxiety and tension. He was often genuinely perplexed about the reality of his actions. He frequently said he was convinced his wife was living——' I can just see her. I am more convinced than before that she is alive, but I know she is dead . . . if it was true that she died, I would beat my head on the wall and end it all.' Later, he was able to accept the idea that his wife was dead. This thought was accompanied by acute attacks of anxiety which he could assuage by picturing himself dying in the gas house chair. Often when unable to sleep because of anxiousness he would review in detail descriptions of executions related of other condemned men.

For a time the prisoner sought religious advice

and was enabled thus to accept the idea of execution with equanimity. About sixteen months after incarceration the depression cleared up. During the time when the prisoner was clinically improved, a series of dreams recurred accenting the castration and dismemberment theme. Parallel with his clinical improvement and mollification of his superego through religious advice and acceptance, projection occurred with less frequency in X's dreams. It was as if the basic conflict at a later time could be accepted more easily by the ego. He dreamed (seventeen months):

I was in a kitchen lying on the sink and drainboard. I was naked and when I stood up I was covered with blood, the whole front of me. I kept trying to wash it off. It came from my chest, abdomen and private parts. Most of it from my penis. The idea was, how can I stop it? There was no pain, blood just oozed out.

In the main there were few associations to these dreams, partly because of their confused and almost psychotic nature. Some of the material of his early life was directly represented in the dream content—some could be interpreted as a distorted image of the dynamic struggle within him between instinctual drives and superego.

In a similar sense his behaviour during the crime was susceptible of interpretation. The request uttered immediately after the shooting, 'Roll her over and see if she is dead', had a primitive ring to it and was reminiscent of the sadistic attitude towards animals of the prepuberty boy. The prisoner's association to this remark was that he has no memory of saying it at all. Later, when asked to what it might relate, he said:

I remember about five years ago we had a lot of catfish in the sink. The next morning I said to my wife, 'See if they are still alive', and more than half were alive.

This remark, obscure in its relation to the manifest content of his crime, could well represent a condensation of aggressive impulses towards women and defence against his own castration fears (fish-penis). It will be remembered the wife-victim was shot in the back and fell forward. It is reasonable to assume that part of this remark had in it a representation of the following unconscious idea: 'Roll her over and see if she is a woman', i.e. 'Am I still a woman?' His cold tone described by the witness seems explicable as a result of isolation of affect from this condensed idea.

Similarly another piece of inexplicable behaviour at the time of the crime is understandable in terms of the psychological movements in this case. X's visit to his mother-in-law on the day of the murder and his repeated remark, 'I hate to do this to you, I love you so much', was considered by the jury and appeal court as a conscious and direct statement of intent to kill his wife. Actually, the murder did occur within an hour of this utterance. On the other hand it has been seen how deeply the revenge motive against women as mothers ran in his unconscious. It is in keeping with the unconscious meaning of the murder as a solution of his intolerable conflict that the prisoner may have spoken the psychological truth. In his confused state, X had an inner perception of a wish to revenge himself against an orally depriving mother. The oral origins of X's revenge were displaced to activities at the genital level. Destructive fantasies of genital type (both oral aggression—biting—and his own castration) are graphically indicated in a dream he had twenty months after the offence. He dreamt he was in a field and saw two hogs having intercourse. 'As the boar pulled out, I saw the insides of the sow hooked on to the penis. It was a sickening dream. The guts came right out, but they both seemed to be all right. I had no idea why I dreamt it.'

X had been described the day of the murder as being 'wild, his eyes glassy . . . dragging his coat on the floor'. There is good clinical reason to believe that X had been in a fugue state for several days. The traditional explanation of a fugue state wherein control of the higher cerebral centres is erased owing to a toxic agent, may have been operative here. It seems more likely, however, that the repressive forces underlying the amnesia and the isolation resulting from the struggle against perception of unconscious passive impulses were stronger factors in the fugue state during which the murder occurred than the effect of alcoholism on cerebral tissues.

Discussion

This case is presented as an experience in psycho-analytic investigation of a murderer. Although this study was hampered by certain practical difficulties and is not anamnestically complete, reconstruction of the unconscious meaning of the murder described might aid in answering the pressing question: What evi-

dences of demonstrable impending ego disturbance presage an outbreak of violent crime in a given individual?

The history of X's boyhood behaviour disorder, his adolescent impulsive activity and early excessive sexuality reveal the presence of instinctual conflicts throughout the prisoner's life. Particularly, X's life-long and increasing alcoholism attests to his feelings of lowered self-esteem. His adult character trait of compliance was apparently a defence against deeply buried, unconscious aggressive impulses. The prisoner's work as a policeman bribed his superego and allowed X to identify with the forces of control. This sublimation, however, was less effective as time went on and more alcohol was needed for him to achieve ego stability. With the decline of his ego control owing to the toxic influence of alcohol on cerebral tissue, amnesias, both of organic and psychological drama in which he was enmeshed, came to light.

The early symptom of depression occurring about two years before the murder requires comment. In it feelings of sexual inadequacy were expressed in an inability to impregnate his wife. It should be noted that this was not a fear of impotence, but a fear of inability to cause his wife to conceive. This anxiety may be interpreted as a defence against deep destructive fantasies against unborn children (siblings). There is also visible in the symptom the unconscious meaning of revenge against women (mothers) which is elaborated in the delirium and dream material. The revenge motif, in addition, implies castration fear derivatives, since to produce children involves losing the penis in the woman. It was at this time that X complained he may have 'done things unbecoming a policeman' while in a blank or fugue state. Later when the prisoner's wife divorced him, X's dependence on her was thrown into bold relief and the unconscious struggle between murderous impulses against women with whom he was identified and ego defences against these impulses was stimulated. Increased alcoholism no longer served the dynamic function of bolstering his self-esteem and repressing his unconscious struggles. From the vantage point furnished by an analysis of X's delirious content, the struggle between instinctual drives and the ego against which X defended himself with less and less success becomes clear. Clinically, his amnesias increased, his confusion was more obvious, his manner more befuddled until the day of the murder.

The castration and dismemberment elements prominent in his productions represented a fear of his own destruction. Fear of destruction had behind it regressive elements relating directly to the oral phase of his development. Through the mechanisms of displacement and projection it can be seen that the prisoner was struggling with tendencies to annihilate women figures, i.e. the mother. His feelings were complicated by unconscious identification with women, so that failing ego defences against the unconscious wish to annihilate the introjected mother figure were signalized by severe anxiety about his body image. The prisoner's dreams showed the strength of the inwardly perceived threat of body transformation to that of a female. In this process were many cross-identifications, but essentially dismemberment meant personal destruction and castration through feminization. The prisoner's anxiety seemed doubly determined. It is interesting that this regressive castration elaboration was projected also on to the prisoner's children and to those of his siblings. The castration motif in the delirium apparently represented a condensation of several unconscious problems; fears of body image destruction at a primitive level, passivity cravings, annihilation fantasies towards siblings and women, and strong guilt feelings stimulated by unconscious murderous impulses.

Basically, X suffered from a life-long masochistic neurosis, the oral origin of which can be seen in the material cited. Castration and dismemberment elements were derivatives of a fear of infantile helplessness. There were also evidences of defence against unconscious passive feelings. Bergler (2) has postulated that the child's 'reactive fear of passivity results in narcissistic rescue attempts at higher developmental levels'. Defences against passivity at regressive levels assume the form of the 'septet of baby fears—the fear of being devoured, fear of being chopped to pieces, fear of castration', and so on.

Bergler (1) has further developed his concept of 'the mechanism of orality' in criminals wherein he feels that the motor aspect of criminal acts is an expression of the wish of the child to make the mother appreciate his capacity to seek revenge (the 'Herostratic' tendency). According to Bergler, the infant's fury at his helplessness and inability to retaliate against

the mother for her fancied lack of interest with its consequent wound to his omnipotence fantasy, becomes the prototype of a revenge pattern. This reaction on the part of the passive infant destined to be a masochist remains as an unconscious drive for revenge against society in later life. Such individuals unconsciously arrange their lives to repeat the pattern of masochistic humiliation and aggressive reaction. The revenge motive and its aggressive reaction derive from an early oral period when incorporation, in the process of achieving object relations, also served destructive impulses against love objects. In the case of X, the murder was an acted-out reaction to an overwhelming passivity which he unconsciously shared with women.

The rôle which the œdipus situation played in the prisoner's development was not too clearly indicated in his productions. It is probable that this situation was a potent factor in his childhood neurosis when at the age of six the death of his sister initiated an obsessional fear of death. Also his unconscious fear of bodily injury may have been a representation of fear of his father for infantile incest fantasies.

The dismemberment and castration tendencies which flooded X's productions were in addition signs of his extreme infantile fury against a mother burdened with ten children, and evidences of superego pressure, since they really were turned upon himself. The torture and mutilation of babies achieved an unconscious purpose, but it also represented self-punishment for such wishes. Unconscious wishes for annihilation of siblings and children came closer to the surface as alcoholism increased its cerebral toxic effect and delirium increased during the three months preceding the murder. At the same time, the prisoner's amnesias and fugues increased. The frequent suicidal ideas and attempts indicated the intensity of the struggle going on within the prisoner between the superego and the id.

The amnesia aided by the alcoholic encephalopathy spread to a point where the prisoner behaved automatically as in a fugue state. Unconscious forces necessitating the amnesia proved too strong for the repressive activity of the ego. The fugue represented a break through into reality of annihilation fantasies. The destructive fantasies eluded the censor and gave form and direction to the prisoner's actions. As Fisher (8) has pointed out in his analysis of fugues and amnestic states, a fugue is a 'subjective escape from consciousness' and is preceded by increased anxiety. In the present case, the accumulation of anxiety increased; repression failed and the individual was forced into a dream-like state in which fantasy elements invaded his reality under cover of the fugue. Fear of the danger to which X had been exposed by his aggressive impulses was dissipated. This would account for his 'cold and deliberate' behaviour during the time of the murder.

The complicating effect of superego pressure must also be considered. Except for the occurrence of the fugue, suicide might well have been the eventual resolution caused by ego pressure exerted by the prisoner's intense castration fear. Suicide was the price exacted by the superego for unconscious annihilation wishes, but with the shunting off of anxiety during the fugue, murder became a compromise —a compromise and a bribe.

The prisoner's attitude after his improvement from his illness demonstrated interesting psychological concomitants. While the prisoner was depressed, during his incarceration, he was preoccupied with the idea that his wife was still living. The conflict between the reality of his situation in 'death row' and his inner feeling that he never had any murderous impulses towards his wife precipitated anew defensive reactions against unconscious wishes. As one legal step after another to save him was lost, the question 'Did I kill?' loomed larger to him. Preoccupation with the idea whether he killed or not was a defence against the thought, 'Did I want to castrate myself', or 'What a fool I was to castrate myself while I was ill.'

It was impossible for the prisoner to understand that he murdered a wife against whom he never had conscious aggressive intentions, because it was impossible for him to understand why he should want to castrate himself. But if it proved true, i.e. that he could be convinced he murdered his wife, he would kill himself and indirectly satisfy his conscience and basic masochistic tendencies. This was the meaning of the comfort he derived from day-dreaming about the gas-house chair and from the solace he received from his religious advisers.

Unconscious trends which study of this case of a murderer revealed, might have assisted in foretelling the probability of violent acting-out. It is recognized that this is only one type of murder. Nevertheless, it appears valid to state

in general terms that aggressive behaviour will ensue when ego strength is insufficient to combat the destructive forces derived from early oral aggression. Whether suicide will occur in a given case depends upon the degree of integrity which the ego can maintain as it withstands the exacting pressure of id and superego. Whether murder will occur depends upon the strength of the revenge motive against the mother-figure, which itself is conditioned by the capacity for projection and introjection, and of feelings of helplessness on the part of the infant who becomes the psychic masochist in later life.

Perhaps the only conclusion tenable is that an estimate of the relative strengths of early oral tendencies as compared with ego strength would furnish material for prognosticating violent crime. The basis for this estimate will be derived solely from psycho-analytic investigation of each case. It may well be that no all-inclusive formula will ever be devised to foretell the response of an ego to unconscious forces bombarding it. Experience may prove that analysis of each childhood or adolescent neurosis (or pre-psychopathic individual), may be required to help society in anticipating and preventing violent crime.

Furthermore, to translate these ideas into terms usable in legal thinking is a difficult task. Psycho-analysis can only urge its help in prevention of crimes through the slow, painful process of study of behaviour problems early in life with subsequent modification of the ego and superego through careful psychotherapy.

The development and confirmation of these findings needs more work in individual cases, but it also requires the dissemination of psycho-analytic concepts to the literate and influential public. Education of this kind will combat currently held ideas illustrative of far-going resistances against psychological knowledge of criminal behaviour. Understanding is pre-requisite to influencing social thinking and social action, and criminological research preliminary to psychological insight should be our primary concern at this juncture of time and human history.

(Received July 26, 1950)

REFERENCES

(1) BERGLER, EDMUND (1947). *Applications of the 'Mechanism of Orality' in Neurosis and Criminosis.* (Philosophical Library, Inc., N.Y., pp. 611–631.)

(2) —— (1949). *The Basic Neurosis, Oral Regression and Psychic Masochism.* (Grune and Stratton, Inc., N.Y., pp. 18 and 19.)

(3) BROMBERG, WALTER, and SCHILDER, PAUL (1936). 'The Attitude of Psychoneurotics towards Death', *Psychoanal. Rev.*, **23**, 1–25.

(4) ——, —— (April, 1933). 'Death and Dying; A Comparative Study of the Attitudes and Mental Reactions toward Death and Dying', *Psychoanal. Rev.*, **20**, 133–85.

(5) ——, —— (April, 1933). 'Psychologic Considerations in Alcoholic Hallucinosis Castration and Dismembering Motives (Zerstückelungsmotiv)', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **14**, Part 2, p. 206.

(6) DEUTSCH, HELENE (1938). 'Folie à Deux', *Psychoanalytic Quart.*, **7**, 315.

(7) FENICHEL, OTTO (1945). *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis.* (W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York), p. 400.

(8) FISHER, CHARLES (1945). 'Amnesic States in War Neuroses: The Psychogenesis of Fugues', *Psychoanal. Quart.*, **14**, No. 4, pp. 437–468.

(9) FREUD, SIGMUND (1934). *Mourning and Melancholia*, **4**, (Hogarth Press, London), p. 152.

(10) HARNIK, J. (1932). 'Introjection and Projection in the Mechanism of Depression', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **13**, p. 428.

(11) KIELHOLZ, A. (May 6, 1926). 'Analyseversuch bei Delirium Tremens', *Int. Z. f. Psychoanal.*, **12**, p. 478.

(12) LEHRMAN, PHILIP R. (1939). 'Some unconscious determinants in homicide', *Psychiatric Quart.*, **13**, p. 605.

(13) MENNINGER, KARL A. (1933). 'Psychoanalytic Aspects of Suicide', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **14**, p. 387.

(14) SCHILDER, PAUL (1936). 'The Attitude of Murderers towards Death', *Journ. Abnormal and Social Psychol.*, **13**, p. 3.

(15) —— (1942). *Goals and Desires of Man.* (Columbia University Press, New York), p. 105.

(16) SCHMIDEBERG, MELITTA (1936). 'A Note on Suicide', *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **17**, p. 4.

(17) TAUSK, V. (1915). *Int. Z. f. Psychoanal.*, **3.**

(18) ZILBOORG, G. (1935). 'Some Sidelights on the Psychology of Murder', *J. Nerv. and Ment. Dis.*, **81**, p. 442.

(19) —— (1936). 'Suicide among Civilized and Primitive Races', *Amer. Journ. Psychiatry*, **92.**

(20). 'Differential Diagnostic Types of Suicide'. *Arch. Neurol. and Psychiat.*, **35** (1936), pp. 270–291.

SEXUAL SYMBOLISM IN INDUSTRY

By MERLIN THOMAS, Neath, Glam.

In this article, examples will be presented of the use of sexual terms in modern industry. The field covered will be restricted to those branches of the engineering industry of which the author has direct knowledge, namely, general engineering, steel, oil refining, and building, with a few examples from mining. It is not suggested that the examples here quoted exhaust the field under observation.

In general engineering, the male and female principles are of fundamental importance. All projections, in fact all fittings that enter into another, are male. All orifices, indents, etc., which receive a fitting or projection, are female. Threads, for instance, are either male or female: those outside are male, those inside female. As illustration we will take a bolt. This has an outside thread, and is male, its function being to go inside the nut. The nut has an inside thread; it is female. The word 'bolt' is used also of, and is perhaps derived from, something which penetrates the human body—an archer's bolt. It has a connexion with classical antiquity, being the weapon of the great god Zeus. (In this connexion it may be remembered that one of the common designations of the penis is 'weapon'.) The word 'nut' is the same as that used to denote the fruit of certain trees. Fruit of various kinds is commonly symbolic of the female genitals.

Bastardy is a pronounced theme in engineering. Threads are of various types, each with its own name, which is determined by the number of threads to the inch. Some firms, however, have devised special series of threads which do not conform to any of the standard types. The purpose of this is to ensure that only accessories made by the firms concerned will be used on their products. Such types are described as bastard threads.

There are other examples of this theme of bastardy. There are bastard files—those whose grain, i.e. roughness, lies midway between small and large. The name is also applied to half-round files, i.e. files which have a flat surface on one side and a half-round on the other. In trade catalogues, however, the term bastard is used only to describe the grain. The word is encountered again in pipe work. Flanges other than high or low pressure flanges are termed bastard flanges. Usually any fitting in engineering which does not correspond to a recognized standard is called bastard. The term is used also in oxy-acetylene and electric welding. The name bastard weld is applied to welds of non-ferrous with ferrous metals, such as brass with steel. The theme of bastardy occurs also in building. In the building of walls various bonds are used. When a bricklayer undertakes a job he is expected to continue with the same bond with which he starts. This, however, is not always practicable, and it may be found at the end of a course that it is impossible to finish with the bond so far used. The final tie or bond which does not conform to the standard hitherto used is termed a bastard bond. In mining also we find the term bastard: it is sometimes applied by the miner to a seam which has a high proportion of shale, or sometimes to a seam that is nearer to the lignites than the bituminous or anthracite coals. Another example is that of bastard steam. In modern engineering steam is passed through an apparatus which dries it, and raises its temperature: it is then called superheated steam. But if for some reason this process is not functioning correctly, the steam is wet, and is then described as bastard steam.

Returning to the male and female principles, another example is the shaft. Shafts are of various sizes, according to the size of the machinery of which they form part. The shaft in engineering is male. It is a long solid cylinder of steel, whose function is to convey the driving power from a steam engine or motor. The bearings of soft metal through which the shaft passes are known as bushes. A bush is female. The word 'bush' (*Oxford English Dictionary*), derived from Middle Dutch, means a box, and in German denotes a small tree or shrub, both common female symbols. We are often told that we were born under a gooseberry bush. The sexual connexion is demonstrated by those workmen who, after their wives have had a number of pregnancies, say that their vaginas need re-bushing. When a bush exceeds a certain length in relation to its diameter it is called a sleeve. Among some workers in industry the clenched fist and the forearm flexed and rising and falling to and from the perpendicular are indicative of an erection and sexual potency.

Callipers are an instrument designed to measure curved surfaces. They are called O.D. or outside diameter callipers when designed for use on convex surfaces; for concave surfaces they resemble dividers, except that the points are turned outwards,

and they are called I.D. or inside diameter callipers. The O.D. is female, it goes outside the fitting to be measured; the I.D. goes inside, and is male. Callipers designed to measure both inside and outside curved surfaces are called hermaphrodite callipers, and are so listed in the trade catalogues.

Dogs. Another male term, ' dog ', is in use. One example is the firedogs on the domestic hearth, which are concerned with poking, feeding the fire, etc.—the firegrate being a common female symbol. Poking is a common vulgar name for coitus.

In industry all the earlier types of clutches are formed of male and female parts. A simple clutch is the dog clutch. The function of the clutch is to engage or disengage an engine or motor to or from the machinery it drives while the engine or motor is still running. In the dog type clutch this is effected by a solid dog wheel which is splined on to the driving shaft of the engine. The spline is a narrow rectangular key which rises above the shaft a fraction of an inch. About four or six splines are placed at regular intervals round the solid shaft, of which they form part. They are male, as are all keys in engineering. The circular hole in the centre of the otherwise solid dog wheel has grooves cut to fit the splines. This enables the dog wheel, by means of suitable lever control, to slide along the splined shaft even while, in company with the shaft, it is in motion. On the dog wheel are short, solid cylindrical projections at equal distances set just inside the circumference of the wheel, and parallel to the shaft; these are called ' dogs '. Further along the shaft is another wheel, the female, running free of the shaft; in this wheel are elongated slots. When the lever attached to the dog wheel is pulled, the dog wheel moves along the spline to engage the slots, the elongated slots making it easy to slip in the dogs. The slotted wheel now rotates with the engine, and is in turn connected by a belt or chain to the machine to be driven. A reverse movement of the clutch lever disengages the dogs, with the consequence that the slotted wheel, and the machinery connected to it, ceases to rotate.

On automobiles this type of clutch is too ' fierce ', so several others have been devised, one of the first of which was the cone clutch. In this type, instead of dog and slot wheels, contact between the engines and the machine to be driven is by means of ' cones '. That on the driving shaft of the engine is called the ' male cone ' (this is the active cone, as with the dogs); the hollow cone on the shaft connected to the machine or vehicle to be driven is called the ' female ' cone. This is lined with fibrous material, like brake lining, so that when the clutch lever is pulled the male cone moves along the splines on the driving shaft, and enters the female. Because of the lining, contact is gradual and the vehicle's speed increases slowly. When the male cone is tight, the full driving force of the engine is applied. A later type of clutch is the plate clutch. This is worked on the same principle as the cone clutch, except that plates are used instead of cones. The active plate, that which moves along the splines, is called the male; the inactive plate, the female.

' Dogs ' are also used upon the permanent way in railways. These are a kind of staples which are driven into the sleepers and clamp down on the rail flange, and are used in between the ' chairs ' which are screwed into the sleepers. The process of driving in the dogs is termed ' dogging '. The chair is a grooved fitting in which the rail rests, and is female.

The term ' dog ' frequently refers to male activity, as instanced by such phrases as ' He's a gay dog ' or ' a sly dog ', commonly used to indicate a rake or a *roué*. A workman who conceals his true earnings from his wife, removing some of the contents from his pay packet and altering the amount shown thereon, is said to be ' dogging ' her.

The name jig is given to a tool or device which has been made to perform one special job and no other. It is often composed of two parts, a male and a female. By means of a jig an unlimited supply of the object intended to be made can be turned out. As a simple example, a jig made to make a set (a bend at a definite angle) such as the links of a chain drive will be described. The bottom or female half is a square block of steel about two inches thick and five inches square. At one end the block is shaped to the required angle of the set, and in the middle is a round hole. The upper or male half is about the same size, with the shaped angle underneath. In the middle and on the underside of the top half is a cylindrical projection, the male, designed to fit into the hole in the female. In use, the link is laid on the planed end of the female, the male is laid on top, and pressure is applied. When the link is removed, it has a set corresponding to the jig, and any number of links can be set thus. One meaning of ' jig ' (*Oxford English Dictionary*) is ' quick courtship '. The sexual connexion in engineering is obvious, as the process described, which is typical of jigs, is compared to coitus and the resulting offspring.

The number of instances of the male and female principles in connexion with couplings are many. In automatic water couplings in the fire service, the female fitting is the larger, and into it the male is pressed. When coiling hoses care has to be exercised to ensure that when ready for use the male of one length of hose is at the right end for the female of the preceding length or *vice versa*. Chain links for driving purposes are male and female, and the chain must be so adjusted that a male and female face each other for connecting up. If a male link snaps, for example, it has to be replaced by a male, otherwise two females would face each other. The bicycle chain is one example of this principle. The shafts connecting the huge rolls of a steel rolling mill to the fly-wheel (often weighing a hundred and fifty tons or more) of the huge engine are coupled by means of a box—which was also female in the

case of a bush. In this coupling the shaft is about eighteen inches to two feet in diameter, and at each end is shaped in a cross about two feet long. The cross is roughly composed of two ellipses laid at right angles. This is male, and is sometimes called a wobble or ' spigot '; this latter name is incorrect, but is determined by the idea of maleness, and will be discussed under ' cocks '. The end of the roll to be coupled is equipped with a similar wobble. The box is a heavy iron casting, cylindrical, about three feet in diameter and two feet long. The inside of the box is hollowed out in the shape of a cross and is identical in size and shape with the wobble. To couple, the box is slipped on to the roll wobble, the shaft lowered into position and slipped into the opposite end of the box. The box is then adjusted to cover half of each wobble, blocks of oak called stretchers are clamped at each end, and the coupling is complete.

The jack, well known to motorists, is composed of a long steel cylinder with a male thread which rises perpendicularly from a steel casing. Its function is to lift heavy weights. It is operated by a lever or handle which turns a worm inside the casing. A worm also is a cylinder with a male thread, whose function is to transfer motion from the horizontal to the perpendicular, or *vice versa*. By turning the worm the jack goes up or down. The dictionary states that the word Jack denotes maleness, as in the nursery rhyme—' Jack of Hearts, he stole the tarts ', or the toy, the ' Jack-in-the-box '. ' Jack ' is the most common of the expressions vulgarly used in industry known to the author for describing an erection.

Another machine for raising heavy weights is the hydraulic ram (these may sometimes be seen at garages). This is a long cylinder of steel, varying in diameter from six inches to a couple of feet. Few objects used in industry arouse more comparison with their own penis among the cruder workers than the ram. The ram is, of course, notorious for its sexual vigour, and in common speech a *roué* is called a ' ram '.

Another example of sexualization is the name of a certain type of chain used in crane work. This is composed of a number of identical links with a very large link of shackle at each end of the chain. This kind of chain is used to pass under a load, one large link being passed through the other drawn tight round the load and the free large link attached to the hook of the crane. With this type of chain the load is more secure than with, say, a dog chain, which is composed of a ring to which are attached two chains ending in two hooks. The first type of chain is called a Brother. The latter type, the dog chain, is more useful for quicker disengaging of the load after lifting.

In pipe fitting, again, examples of sexual terms are found. A ' cock ' is a mechanism for controlling the flow of liquids or gases through a pipe. There are other mechanisms for this purpose, such as taps, valves, etc., but their principles are different, and the cock is probably the oldest of such mechanisms. It consists of an outer casing with circular holes at opposite ends to permit entry and egress of the fluid or gas. Into the casing, at right angles to the direction of flow, is inserted a solid metal cylinder through which is bored a hole with the same diameter as the pipe to be controlled. At the top of the cylinder is a lever which turns it. A quarter turn in any direction brings the hole opposite the pipe, thus allowing a full flow. Another quarter turn in any direction takes the hole right out of line of the pipe and cuts the flow off completely. The mechanism of the cock is very simple, but it is not suitable for use under very high pressure. It has therefore been superseded in great measure by the valve, which works on the screw principle (as in the kitchen tap) and allows of finer adjustment. All these controlling mechanisms are male. For the layman, the chance of seeing a cock in modern times is remote, except perhaps on the motor car, where it may be used for draining off an oil sump, or again in a café on the tea-urns or mineral water barrels, where there is little pressure and it is particularly well suited for rapid service. In industry cocks are used extensively in oil refineries, where a great many pipe lines are gravity lines.

Another type of control on pipe lines, one which the author has never encountered outside an oil refinery, is the spade. This is used to stop completely the flow in a pipe line at a given point for a shorter or longer period. It consists of a flat circular steel plate, its diameter being equal to that inside the holes in the flanges between which the spade is inserted. In high-pressure pipe lines, the spade is shaped like a figure eight, one circle having a hole the same diameter as the pipe line, so that when the flow is required the blank end of the spade is removed from the flanges and the other end inserted. Flanges are regarded as female; when they press evenly together they are said to ' kiss all round '. This, of course, is the desired position, for otherwise they would leak. Pipe flanges are a type of coupling, the male element being supplied by the bolts, which go through both flanges to secure them. The spade is male.

Another sexual term used in pipe fitting is the nipple. This is a short piece of pipe, its length being determined by its diameter. The larger the diameter, the larger the nipple, the proportions remaining constant. At each end is a male thread, the centre of the pipe with no thread being roughly the same as one thread. There appears to be here an unconscious identification of the breast with the phallus, as all pipes are male, having male threads; in the nipple we have the two male threads very close together. Two other examples of the nipple familiar to many, are those of the Primus stove and blowlamp, where its shape is identical with the human nipple.

On pipe fittings a length of pipe is called a leg. The penis is often called a third leg. The machine used to cut the male threads on a leg is called a stocks and dies. One of the most common types of coupling used for joining two lengths of pipe is called a socket. This is a female fitting. There are also elbows, knuckles, etc., and the tool used for cutting female threads is called a taps. The taps is a steel cylinder, very hard and with a male thread. The taps or tap is entered into the hole in which a female thread is to be cut, turned slowly, tapped gently, turned again and so on until the thread has been cut in the hole to the depth required. It is worth noting here that this tool has the same name as one of the devices for control of liquids, etc., which as we have seen is male. Indeed, all tools are regarded as male, and one of the most common names for the penis is ' tool '.

Spigots and faucets are devices for controlling liquids, etc., usually used on barrels. The faucet is the wooden pipe which is connected or rather tapped into the bung hole of the barrel. The spigot is like the cylinder of the cock and works on the same principle. It is a male fitting, which explains why the name is sometimes applied to male couplings as mentioned above. The devices used in W.C. cisterns which are now usually called ball valves are really ball cocks, and were formerly so called. They work on the same principle as the cock in that a cylinder of steel (or brass) allows or prevents the entry of water into the cistern. The change of name may well have been a concession to public sensitiveness.

A key in engineering is usually used for securing a wheel to a shaft. In the shafts and wheels are keyways, which together represent the shape and thickness of the key. The key is usually wedge-shaped, the thinner end being driven in first. The keyways are indents or channels shaped to correspond. All keys are male and keyways female.

The pinchbar used for levering heavy weights, etc., by hand, stimulates many of its users to comparisons with the penis, so that we hear it said with monotonous regularity when someone uses the pinchbar inexpertly ' I could do better with my prick '. When using this tool the angle for ideal results is approximately the same as that of the erect penis on a standing male. If a novice inserts the bar at a lower angle, he is laughed at, as the power of the lever is reduced. Should he place it, on the other hand, nearer the perpendicular, he is regarded as being over-ambitious, and is told that his bar is too proud. This, however, appears to be regarded as a manly failing, and the novice is instructed correctly with more respect.

In the steel industry we meet with pig-iron. This is so named after the beds into which it runs at tapping. The beds used in tapping a blast furnace are composed of sandy loam and are laid out in long canals, called sows, about nine inches wide by six inches deep. At right angles and about nine inches apart are cul-de-sac canals the same depth as the sows, about four inches wide and between two and three feet long. These are the pigs. When the furnace is tapped the molten iron rushes out into the sows and thence into the pigs. The sows feed the pigs. One very old blast-furnaceman insisted that the ' sows ' were giving birth to the ' pigs '. When the resultant impure iron, or ' pig-iron ', has solidified the pigs are broken off the sows, the sows cracked up into lengths roughly the same as that of the pigs, and then despatched to the iron foundry or steel works.

In the steel works, which to many is the material basis of modern civilization, the smelting of steel is compared to pregnancy. Let us assume that the furnace, which is always called ' She ', is empty after tapping. The first task is fettling, that is repairing ' her bottom and bays (sides) '. Fettling over, the furnace is charged. The charge is the first load of steel scrap plus pig-iron, which is placed in the furnace. All subsequent steel scrap placed in the furnace (no pig-iron is placed in the furnace again except in emergency) is called feeding. It would seem that the first load or charge is symbolical of coitus. It must be mentioned here that without the addition of pig-iron, whose bulk is only about 35 per cent. to 65 per cent. of scrap, the resulting product would be useless. As a furnaceman would put it, ' It puts life into the scrap '. The term feeding, too, suggests that a fœtus is being nourished so that it may grow, as in a way it does, scrap being fed into the furnace and melted until the furnace can hold no more. The furnace—' she '—is now nearly ready for tapping, and samples are taken for analysis. The implement used for this purpose is called a sample spoon—it may be remembered here that a spoon is a phallic symbol. In Wales it was customary for the aspiring lover to send the lady of his desire a spoon as a token of his affection and, if she accepted his advances and began a courtship, she used the spoon to indicate her acceptance. At a later stage the spoon ceased to be utilitarian, grew larger and became elaborately decorated—this may be the origin of the term ' spooning '. In illustrations of the nursery rhyme ' Hey diddle diddle ', the dish and the spoon are usually depicted by the artist as female and male respectively. Sampling proving satisfactory, the huge ladle, a steel vessel lined with firebricks, is pushed up to the rear of the furnace, opposite the tap-hole. The furnace is now said to be ' up ladle ', and amongst steel workers this phrase is used of a woman who is obviously pregnant. All that now remains is to get sufficient heat to tap. The heat of the molten metal is ascertained by pushing a long steel rod into the furnace. An expression for coitus among furnacemen is ' giving her the rod '. If metal clings to the end of the rod, the furnace is not ready; if the rod melts clear at the point of entry, the furnace is ready. That this operation is highly sexualized may easily be ascertained from the

expressions of the furnacemen during its performance, particularly when a young hand is learning it. From now on there is the same urgency in getting the furnace tapped as at a confinement. One of the furnacemen goes to the tap-hole, which is similar in shape to the female genitals, and starts breaking with a long steel bar the hardened fireclay which fills it. Once broken through, the molten steel rushes out along a short canal lined with firebricks called a lander and into the ladle. In a recent article in the *News Chronicle* a writer described the steel furnaces of Sheffield and Rotherham as the ' great ladies of Yorkshire '. The steel is followed by the slag, also in molten condition. The furnace is emptied, and the operation begins once more.

I would now draw attention to the names Bays and Lander, both of which suggest the sea or water. The lander is the canal that conveys the steel (the baby) from the furnace to the ladle, and the word gives the impression that something is being landed, brought out of water. Water is often a symbol of birth. The slag is continually being compared with the ' after-birth ', and the writer has heard an old hand-furnaceman in a lecture to some young ones on their trade insist that they regard their furnace as a woman and that ' she must be treated similarly '. As he put it, ' It's no use trying to force her, she must be coaxed '.

In this industry the names of objects are frequently condensed into female names. Thus manganese is called ' Mag ', an abbreviation of Margaret. The electric magnet which loads the scrap is called ' Maggie ' and the box trimmer, the man who keeps the scrap tidy, is said to be ' following Maggie '. Dolomite becomes ' Dolly ', and the huge heat generators underneath each furnace are known as the ' Jinnys ', a Welsh abbreviation of Jane.

As soon as the ladle is full it is taken from the furnace and placed above the Ingot Moulds into which it is teemed—teeming also means giving birth. The man who directs this operation is called the teemer. When the ingots have solidified they are stripped from the moulds and carried to furnaces to be reheated for rolling; these furnaces are in the floor and are called ' Soaking Pits '. An ingot that is not properly warmed is said to be ' not soaked ' and the rollerman will complain that they are ' rolling dry '. To a layman hearing a conversation along those lines the implication would be that the ingots were placed in some kind of liquid, but all the references are to fire. The unconscious identification of fire, water, and birth is apparent.

At the next stage, the rolling stage, the ingot appears to be identified with the penis rather than with the child. A badly teemed ingot which has too much metal is said to have a ' big head ', and one that has too little, so that when stripped it has a thin end projecting about two or more inches, is called a ' box hat '. The word ingot itself also suggests something that ' gets in ' to something else, as indeed it does—into the rolls. The rolls are female, and their parts are described anthropomorphically. At each end is the spigot or wobble which goes into the box coupling. Next are the necks, one on each side, which are the parts of the rolls which turn in a bearing. Between the body of the roll, which is the part that does the work, and the neck are the shoulders. In the bar mill now to be described the body of the roll has flanges of varying thicknesses which are called collars. The spaces formed by the collars are called the holes. When rolling the ingot, it passes inside the collars into the hole, and when it is through the engine stops, reverses, and the ingot is rolled back in the opposite direction. This to and fro motion, which is strongly reminiscent of coitus, goes on until the ingot is the required thickness.

The ingot may now be a bar of forty to eighty feet in length. It is conveyed to a shear, cut into convenient lengths, and then conveyed to a long narrow rectangular hole in the ground called the pot. These bars, as far as the heavy steel works are concerned, are the finished product. Ingots for rolling rarely exceed fifteen tons, but for forging they may attain a weight of sixty tons. These, however, are called ' beasts '—not ingots. ' Beast ' or ' brute ' are among the less common names applied to the penis.

In steel sheet practice, the bodies of the rolls are without collars and are smooth and flat. The bars are cut about three inches narrower than the width or body of the roll, and after about two days' wear a thin line appears about one and a half inches from each end of the roll. This is called the ' bearing ', and all the bars and sheets have to be kept inside these lines for the remainder of the week. The space inside is called the hole, and rolling becomes increasingly difficult as the week proceeds. It takes a high degree of skill to ' find the hole ', as it is called, at the end of the week, and a rollerman who finds difficulty in doing so is advised to practice coitus more frequently to improve his skill. In this trade too, and in tinplate rolling, the term ' soak ' is used to indicate proper heating.

A house is a common female symbol. The two bastions which project into a room to form the fireplace enclose the part of a room called the breast. The space formed by the breast is called the well, and accommodates the firegrate, thus showing unconscious identification of fire and water. The term breast perhaps explains the term mantelpiece. A mantle or mantel is a garment for the upper half of the body worn mostly by women. Amongst builders brick rubble and the mixture of cement and sand called compo used for tying the courses together are referred to quite frequently as shit. The plumb-bob is the traditional method used by masons for ascertaining the perpendicular. This is slowly giving way to the plumb-rule, which is a combination of spirit levels. The older masons

aver that the plumb-bob is the only true method, though the plumb-rule is very much quicker to use. That there is a displaced sexual pleasure in using the plumb-bob is likely from the fact that one of the commonest descriptions for masturbation is ' jerking one's plumb '.

A mine shaft is driven into the earth and, as we have seen in the field of general engineering, this term is male. A mine shaft when completed is a hole, but the act of making it is male—the expression used being ' driving a shaft '. A cock in mining refers to the charge of gelignite used for blowing up rocks. A hole is drilled into the rock, a cock of gelignite is inserted, then electrically detonated and coal is produced.

From the examples cited it would appear that the choice of names for the various tools, fittings, processes, etc., is determined by the sexual instinct. Contact with those who use these terms reveals a continual comparison of them in their thoughts, speech and actions with sexual ideas (Sexualization). Sexual acts and organs are described in terms of an industrial process, tool or fitting and *vice versa*. The charge has often been made against psychoanalysis that its interpretations are monotonous, but nowhere in the author's experience is this monotony more evident than in the interchanges described.

(Received May 15, 1950)

OBITUARY

JOHAN H. W. VAN OPHUIJSEN

Dr. Johan H. W. van Ophuijsen was born on 12 November, 1882, in Sumatra. At thirteen he returned to Holland to continue his education. While yet at secondary school he became interested in hypnotism and suggestion and accumulated a small library on these subjects. He first encountered the name of Sigmund Freud through Freud's translation into German of Bernheim's book on hypnotism. In addition to a strong scientific bent he was gifted musically, became a talented organist, and was particularly fascinated by the works of Bach, to such an extent that at one time he contemplated making his career as organist.

He graduated from the University of Leiden Medical School in 1909. He had studied neurology with Cassirer at the famous clinic in Berlin where such men as Oppenheim and Lewandowsky had worked. He had studied the psychiatry of his day and, like many others, found it inadequate to explain the behaviour of his psychotic patients. While at medical school he read with eagerness and excitement about the new science of psycho-analysis, and immediately on graduation he went to Bleuler's Clinic at Zürich. There he stayed for four years, and during this time became determined to follow as a life career the science of analysis.

In 1913 he returned to The Hague to become one of the Dutch pioneers of analysis along with van Emden, van Renterghem and Dr. J. and Dr. A. Starcke. In 1917 he helped to found the Dutch Psycho-Analytical Society, of which for seven years he was the president.

Through his efforts and those of his Dutch associates there came about what Freud called 'the first official recognition of dream interpretation and psycho-analysis in Europe', given by Dr. Jelgersma, a psychiatrist, and the rector of the University of Leiden, in his official address on 9 February, 1914.

In 1920 van Ophuijsen organized the first International Psycho-Analytic Congress after World War 1. From 1925 to 1936 he was an important figure in the International Psycho-Analytic Association, serving as member of the executive committee, treasurer and vice-president. In 1935 he came to the United States to teach at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute.

In that country as in Holland he was actively concerned with bringing psycho-analysis into allied fields, and on arriving in the U.S.A. he became chief of the psychiatric staff of the Jewish Board of Guardians, a child guidance agency. He joined the psychiatric staffs of the Mt. Sinai Hospital, the Lenox Hill Hospital, the Veterans Administration, and was a lecturer at the Long Island College of Medicine.

In 1919 in a paper 'On the Origin of the Feeling of Persecution' (*Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **1,** 1920) he elaborated the thesis that the feeling of persecution consists of a fear of an assault from behind. Abraham in his *The Development of the Libido* emphasizes the importance of this contribution.

In 1917 he gave a paper on 'Contributions to the Masculinity Complex in Women' (*Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **5,** 1924) in which he described the revenge type of reaction to absence of the penis in women, characterized by penis wish-fulfilment fantasies, strong urethral erotism and persistent clitoral masturbation. In 1925 he gave his paper 'The Sexual Aim of Sadism as Manifested in Acts of Violence' (*Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, **10,** 1929), wherein he wrote against an earlier view that sadism arose primarily from genital sensation and showed its relation to the second oral phase of biting. Abraham characterized this as an important addition to our knowledge of sadism and of melancholia.

Throughout his analytic career Dr. van Ophuijsen remained interested in the organic and physiologic substratum of mental illness. In recent years his interest in neuro-biology became sharper, and as an expression of it he became the director of the new Creedmore Institute for Psychobiologic Studies. Here he had laid plans for a great research programme on the study of the somatic sources of the instincts and of their pathological development.

Dr. van Ophuijsen's greatest energy went into

teaching psychiatrists, case workers and psychologists. He stressed and had great skill in encouraging clarity in thinking, and it is through his many students that his work will be fulfilled. He died, after a day's psycho-analytic work, shortly after seeing his last patient.

Emanuel Klein.

BOOK REVIEWS

Collected Papers on Psycho-analysis. By Ella Freeman Sharpe, edited by Marjorie Brierley, with a Preface by Ernest Jones. (International Psycho-Analytical Library, No. 36. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1950. Pp. 280. 21*s.*)

Ella Sharpe's wide range of interests, both in clinical psycho-analysis and in the application of psycho-analysis to æsthetic problems, makes it impossible for the reviewer to attempt to do more than draw attention to a few aspects of the work of an analyst who possessed, in addition to her scientific knowledge, literary and imaginative gifts of an altogether exceptional kind.

The papers included in this volume have been divided by the editor into three groups. The first, Papers on Technique, contains seven lectures on this subject and 'The Psycho-Analyst' (1947), which was to have been the first chapter of a book entitled *Talks to Students of Psycho-Analysis* in preparation at the time of her death in 1947. In addition to the two papers on sublimation discussed later in this review, the second group contains 'Psycho-Physical Problems revealed in Language: an Examination of Metaphor' (1940), in which the evolution of metaphor is related to the acquisition of control over the bodily orifices, and 'Cautionary Tales' (1943), in which the development of defences against instinctual impulses is related to the child's discovery of real external dangers. The third group contains three papers on Shakespearean criticism and 'Francis Thompson: a Psycho-Analytical Study' (1925).

With the single exception of the paper on Francis Thompson, which is reprinted from the *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, all the papers have been previously published in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*. Perhaps the most interesting and characteristic is the unfinished paper on Hamlet, which Marjorie Brierley has extracted from the manuscript of a study upon which Ella Sharpe was engaged at the time of her death. This work, which has been provisionally entitled 'The Cyclic Movement in Shakespeare's Plays', was planned as an interpretation of Shakespeare's work in terms of manic-depressive mechanisms. Although what survives is obviously only a small part of what promised to be a major contribution to Shakespearean criticism, Dr. Brierley has fortunately been able to rescue enough to make the general line of Ella Sharpe's thought entirely clear, while Ella Sharpe herself had already in 'From King Lear to the Tempest' (1946) foreshadowed many of the conclusions which she had hoped to justify and elaborate in the completed work. Her standpoint differs from earlier analytical approaches to Shakespeare in her recognition that no single character in any play can be identified completely with the dramatist; that, for instance, Hamlet is no more and no less Shakespeare than are Ophelia and Fortinbras. The plays as a whole portray his intra-psychic conflicts, his unconscious imagos and incorporated objects being personified in the various characters. As in the analysis of a dream, all the actors and every detail of their action and speech are relevant to the understanding of the playwright. Shakespeare was in reality, she points out, probably more like Fortinbras than Hamlet; the death of the neurotic Hamlet and the survival of the stable Fortinbras represent the victory of Shakespeare's ego over the conflicts engendered by his father's death.

The recognition that the plays as a whole depict the dramatist's inner conflicts enables every detail to be used as manifest content, which can be interpreted in terms of unconscious fantasy and infantile experience. By a logical and intellectually courageous acceptance of this idea, Ella Sharpe was able to make a number of specific reconstructions of traumata in Shakespeare's childhood and of his response to them.

Ella Sharpe's interest in Shakespeare was born of a profound belief in the necessity of art for life, and in the indispensability of art as well as science in understanding human nature. 'Scientists will fail unless there is fused with science something of creative art; the artist will fail unless he has the detachment and objectivity of the scientist.' 'In these plays, if anywhere, is evidence of man's unconscious power to discipline and unify to creative ends his inner chaos of passion and destructiveness. There are naturally many different ways of achieving similar ends, but the only final alternative to war and other forms of man's cruelty to man is the further development of his ability to use his destructive passions to constructive ends.'

The transformation of destructive feelings into creative activity is the theme of the two papers on Sublimation. Of these the earlier, 'Certain Aspects of Sublimation and Delusion' (1930), is perhaps the more illuminating, as the argument is illustrated by clinical material taken from the analyses of a dancer, a singer, and a psychotic who developed an interest in historical research following the resolution of a delusion of persecution. In each case she shows how the sublimation was rooted in a

fantasy of being in omnipotent control of incorporated parents, who, in the absence of the fantasy, would have been felt as persecutors. The sublimation made possible a reparation, a re-creation of objects felt to have been destroyed by infantile aggression. The originality of this paper lies as much in the dramatic skill with which the clinical data are presented as in the theoretical formulations. It must be admitted that the very qualities which make all Ella Sharpe's work such a pleasure to read sometimes make it hard to relate her theoretical ideas to those of other writers, though it is clear that the formulations in this paper run closely parallel to those put forward by Melanie Klein in her almost exactly contemporaneous 'Infantile Anxiety-Situations Reflected in a Work of Art'. In her later writings on Shakespeare Ella Sharpe seems to have moved towards a view of artistic creativeness in which genital libido played a more important part than the earlier papers on sublimation implied. 'Sin and repentance are not the dynamic powers which initiate and maintain sublimation. The dynamic power is libido, operating through the libidinal wishes frustrated prior to the latency period. In my opinion, the repression of the Œdipal drives tends to endow the component impulses of pre-genital sexuality with something of the creative purpose of genitality.'

The seven lectures on Technique (1930) should, as pointed out by Ernest Jones in his preface, be read in conjunction with her *Dream Analysis*, which was published in the International Psycho-Analytical Library in 1937. Her ability to write about patients as living people, whose personalities and individuality are never obscured by the use of technical jargon or psycho-pathological abstractions, makes these lectures unique in providing the student, to whom they were originally addressed, with a vivid picture of what actually happens in the analytical session and of the emotional significance of analysis for both patient and analyst. She has particularly valuable things to say about the relationship of the analyst's self-knowledge and freedom from inner anxiety to empathy, and about how analysis as an art provides a sublimation of the analyst's own unconscious drives. She reverts to this theme in 'The Psycho-Analyst' (1947).

C. F. Rycroft.

Modern Abnormal Psychology. A Symposium edited by William H. Miskell. (Philosophical Library, New York, 1950. Pp. 880.)

Textbook of Abnormal Psychology. By C. Landis and M. Bolles. (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1950. Pp. 634. 37*s.* 6*d.*)

The first of these two textbooks aims at reaching a general public interested in abnormal psychology and serving students as a reference and source book. It sets out to deal with 'definitive and dynamic aspects' of its subject with some emphasis on the historical evolution of contemporary concepts. Although claiming an impartial and eclectic presentation there is a clear bias toward Freudian psycho-analysis (or perhaps one should say near-Freudian. A Freudian analyst might well be surprised at the rôles he is expected to play in treatment. He is regarded among other things as 'an efficiency expert' (*sic*), social worker and educator). The various contributions are somewhat uneven. For the most part the writing is diffuse and racy; at its worst scarcely rising in style above the level of a popular *Digest*. The treatment accorded to such topics as the relation of genius to insanity is embarrassingly unscholarly. Through poor organization of its material it cannot be regarded as adequately fulfilling its purpose as a book of reference. On the virtuous side it can, however, be said to be up-to-the-minute, but so much so that one cannot escape the conclusion that there is an element of pot-boiling in its production.

Dr. Landis' textbook is too well known to require much critical discussion. It is serious, comprehensive and balanced. The arrangement is along traditional lines and the viewpoint is again broadly eclectic (although here the bias is towards the Meyerian). Psycho-analysis obtains a more accurate condensation than is customary in a book of this nature. It is highly recommended both to psychiatrists and to clinical psychologists.

James Anthony.

Anxiety in Pregnancy and Childbirth. By Henriette R. Klein, Howard W. Potter and Ruth B. Dyk. (New York: Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., Medical Book Department of Harper and Brothers, 1950.)

This is a 'psychosomatic medicine monograph' written by a psycho-analyst, a psychiatrist and a psychiatric social worker. The study was carried on at the Long Island College Hospital in 1945–46, and initially included all primiparous patients admitted to the maternity service at that time; but data were sufficiently complete for only twenty-seven patients (64 per cent) of the group to be worthy of final correlative study.

To this reviewer it seems that the study is too general for the limited number of cases, which are obviously selected not by the authors but by the circumstances of clinic attendance and perhaps by the time (immediately on the close of the war).

There are some interesting, seemingly incidental observations, e.g. that all of the women who (consciously) strongly desired their babies wanted to nurse them, while the others predominantly did not wish to do so; that the two unmarried women who were most rejecting of their babies had compromised with the expectation of having girls, and were openly resentful of having boys. The authors believe that in the group in general preferential expectation regarding the sex of the child was not strong.

Regarding anxiety in pregnancy and childbirth (the title of the essay), the authors seem to conclude that the anxiety during pregnancy was not specifically related to pregnancy itself, and that anxious behaviour during pregnancy was not correlated with similarly disturbed behaviour during delivery.

This is a pilot study. It is to be regretted that it was not possible to make a more intensive research, including investigation of unconscious attitudes and motivations. A limited bibliography is appended.

Phyllis Greenacre.

NEWS, NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Bureau of the 17th International Psychoanalytical Congress has been opened at Amsterdam-Z., J. W. Browersplein 21 (Cables: Psychanco, Amsterdam).

The Dutch Committee on Arrangements faces the difficult task of organizing the Congress at the height of the European travel season and it requests all those who have not yet sent in their forms to do so immediately.

The International Congress for Psychotherapeutics will be held at Leiden-Oegstgeest (Holland) from September 5th—8th. The subject to be discussed will be: The Affective Contact. Two members of the Dutch Psycho-Analytic Society, Drs. P. J. van der Leeuw and H. G. van der Waals are members of the Congress Committee. Correspondence should be addressed to: The Dutch Society for Psychotherapeutics, Psychiatric Clinic of the State University, Leiden, Holland.

Training in Psycho-analytic Medicine is now being carried out at the College of Medicine at New York City of the State University of New York. Dr. Howard W. Potter, Professor of Psychiatry and Executive Officer of the Department of Psychiatry, has set up within the Department a Division of Psychoanalytic Medicine. Dr. Sándor Lorand has been appointed Chairman of the Executive Committee of this division. This committee is responsible to the Department of Psychiatry for recommendations as to choice of students, arrangement of courses and teaching and for choice of the psychoanalytic faculty. Recognition as a training centre has been granted by the Board of Professional Standards of the American Psychoanalytic Association.

Candidates for training are appointed from among graduates of the Psychiatric Residency Program, from psychiatric residents in advanced standing and from members of the staff of the College and its affiliated hospitals.

A clinic for analytically oriented psychotherapy is at present in operation at the Kings County Hospital. Psycho-analytic therapy will shortly be provided through the same clinic. Students in training staff the clinic and daily supervision is provided by members of the psycho-analytic faculty.

The 2nd International Congress of Criminology was held in Paris at the Sorbonne from September 10 to 18, 1950. The Congress was concerned mainly with a general study and discussion of the methodology with special reference to ætiological studies. There was also a special series of meetings on the 'État dangereux', i.e. the study of the potentially serious offender. Psycho-analysts may be interested to know that the general rapporteur for Psychology, Psychiatry and Psycho-analysis was Dr. Denis Carroll (London Institute of Psycho-Analysis) and for the synthetic study of the relation of psychological and criminological studies to those made by biology and sociology Dr. Daniel Lagache (French Psycho-analytical Society). Dr. Carroll has been elected President of the International Society of Criminology.